

Vol. XXV.

JULY, 1948.

No. 3.

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law,
Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially
invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publica-
tion, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back
numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's
College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 12/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector,
either by postal order or cheque.

*The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number
to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.*

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives
for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South
Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. Brian Carmichael, Corinda, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P.,
Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Parnell, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. E. Glowrey, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst,
N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Herberton, Q.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs,
W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rock-
hampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Bright, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. H. Larkins, Wagga, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F.,
Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor: REV. T. VEECH,

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The
Australasian Catholic Record
A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction
"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

APOSTOLIC BLESSING	175
OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,	
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.	176
Apostolic Constitution on Orders—Faculties to hear Confessions on aerial journeys—Administration of Confirmation in danger of death—Admonition concerning Cause of Guy de Fontgalland—Letter on Pentateuch—Eucharist fast.	
THE CALENDAR	Rev. Daniel O'Connell, S.J. 185
DOM HUGH CONNOLLY—IN MEMORIAM,	
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.	195
THE CATHOLIC MATERNITY GUILD APOSTOLATE,	
Rev. E. Dunne, C.S.S.R.	202
MORAL THEOLOGY	Very Rev. James Madden, D.D. 208
Nurses and Co-operation in illicit operations—Social Function and aid to non-catholic sect—Reconciliation of communists and apostates.	
CANON LAW	Very Rev. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L. 219
Marriages of lapsed or nominal Catholics—Faculties to hear Confessions at sea—Faculties to hear Confessions while travelling by air.	
LITURGY	Very Rev. James Madden, D.D. 228
Extraordinary Minister of Confirmation—Mass without a server—Tones of voice—Funeral rite for a Priest, I (Rev. R. Donohoe).	
HOMILETICS	Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D. 236
Instructions for men, VII, Christ founded a Church.	
NOTES	240
Apostolic Constitution on Holy Orders—Queries on Christian Names —Rimbaud, a Catholic?	
BOOK REVIEWS	252
<i>The Book of Psalms</i> (Knox); <i>De Deo Creatore</i> (Daffara); <i>Platform Replies</i> (Arendzen); <i>Crusade of Fatima</i> (De Marchi); <i>Abbe Edgeworth</i> (Woodgate); <i>Father Dominic Barberi</i> (Gwynn); <i>Priest-Workman in Germany</i> (Perrin); <i>Ancient Christian Writers</i> (ed. Quasten-Plumpe); <i>Ways of Confucius and of Christ</i> (Tseng-Tsiang); <i>Ethical Guide for Nurses</i> (Rumble); <i>Christianity and National Patriotism</i> (Murtagh).	

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Die 1a Julii, 1948.

Apostolic Blessing

Ex Aedibus Vaticanis, die 29 aprilis 1948.

SEGRETERIA DI STATO

di

SUA SANTITA

N 161407.

Rev. me Domine,

Communi quidem gaudio istorum utriusque cleri sacerdotum eximius Commentarius, cui nomen "The Australasian Catholic Record", vigesimum quintum sui natalis annum feliciter commemorat.

Peculiaris laetitiae eventus optatam Beatissimo Patri praebet occasionem gratulantis animi Sui tibi tuisque egregis in labore sociis significandi, cum propter navitatis constantiam, cum propter doctrinæ peritiam, cum potissimum propter amoris liberalitatem, quibus in foven-dum, conscribendum atque pervulgandum memoratum Commentarium hactenus incubuistis.

Haud siquidem Augusto Pontifici ignotum est quantopere idem Commentarius per quinque lustrorum seriem ad sacras disciplinas collustrandas earumque studium inter evangelii ministros istius Nationis provehendum contulerit. Indicia profecto sunt numerosa, quae huc illuc circumferuntur, eius exemplaria, sedula, qua legitur, cura, simulque spectabilis, quam sibi perperit, auctoritas.

Ex animo igitur Sanctitas Sua grates vobiscum Deo refert, atque, dum fervida suscipit vota, ut Commentarius de quo supra ubiores in posterum capere possit scientiae et pietatis fructus, perlubenter tibi, singulis tecum operam dantibus, scriptoribus et lectoribus, caelestium munerum auspicem, Apostolicam impertit Benedictionem.

Interea quo par est observantia me profiteor.

Rev.mo Domino
Commentarii "The Australasian
Catholic Record" Curatori
Sydneyum

Tibi
addictissimum
J. B. Montini
subst.

Official Documents

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION
*on the sacred orders of diaconate presbyterate
and episcopate*
PIUS BISHOP
*servant of the servants of God
for a perpetual remembrance.*

1. Through the Sacrament of Order, instituted by Christ our Lord, spiritual power is handed on and grace is conferred for the due exercise of ecclesiastical functions. That this Sacrament is one and the same for the universal Church is a tenet of Catholic faith; for as our Lord Jesus Christ gave the Church only one and the same government under the Prince of the Apostles, likewise one and the same faith and one and the same sacrifice, so also He gave only one and the same treasure of efficacious signs of grace, which are called Sacraments. In place of these Sacraments instituted by Christ our Lord the Church has not in the course of centuries substituted other Sacraments. Such a substitution is outside her power, as the Council of Trent teaches when it defines (Conc. Trid., Sess. VII, Can. 1, *De Sacram. in genere*) that the seven Sacraments of the New Law were all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord and that the Church has no power over "the substance of the Sacraments". This means that she has no power over those things which, on the testimony of the sources of divine revelation, Christ Himself ordained as constituents of the sacramental sign.

2. The Sacrament of Order is the subject of the present Constitution. In regard to this Sacrament it happened, notwithstanding its unity and identity (which no Catholic could ever call into doubt), that with the progress of ages, according to the diversity of times and places, various rites were added in the conferring of it. This fact gave rise to a question among theologians, namely, which amongst these rites which have been used in conferring the Sacrament of Order belong to the essence, and which do not belong to the essence. Likewise the accretion to the sacramental sign caused doubts and anxieties in particular cases and therefore time after time humble petition was made to the Apostolic See for a decision by the supreme authority of the Church which would state what is required for validity in the conferring of Sacred Orders.

3. There is universal consensu~~s~~ that the Sacraments of the New

Law, being signs which are both sense-perceptible and productive of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they produce and produce what they signify. Now the effects which must be produced by the Sacred Ordination of Diaconate, Presbyterate and Episcopate and must therefore be signified—namely special powers and graces—are in all rites of the universal Church at all times and in all places found sufficiently signified in an imposition of hands and in the words which determine it. Moreover, nobody is unaware that the Roman Church always regarded as valid the Ordinations conferred in the Greek Rite without any tradition of instruments. Hence in the Council of Florence, wherein the union of the Greeks with the Roman Church was effected, no obligation of changing their rite of ordination or of inserting tradition of instruments was imposed on the Greeks. On the contrary, the Church wished that even in the city of Rome Greeks should be ordained according to their own rite. From this it is to be gathered that even according to the mind of the Council of Florence itself the tradition of instruments was not required by the will of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself for the substance and validity of this Sacrament. If, indeed, by the will and ordinance of the Church it was sometimes necessary, for the valid Sacrament, everyone knows that the Church can change and abrogate her own ordinance.

4. This being so, having invoked light from God, We declare with Our supreme Apostolic Authority and with certain knowledge, and as far as it is necessary, We decree and dispose that the matter and the only matter of the Sacred Orders of Diaconate, Presbyterate and Episcopate is the imposition of hands; and that the form and the only form consists of the words which determine the application of that matter, namely, those by which the sacramental effects, that is, the power of Order and the grace of the Holy Spirit, are univocally signified, and which as such are received and employed by the Church. Hence in consequence We declare, and in order to remove all controversy and all anxiety of conscience We do hereby declare by Our Apostolic Authority, and, if it was ever legitimately disposed otherwise, We ordain that at least hereafter the tradition of instruments is not necessary for the validity of the Sacred Orders of Diaconate, Presbyterate, and Episcopate.

5. Concerning the matter and form in the conferring of each Order We decree and ordain as follows by the same supreme Apostolic Authority: In Diaconal Ordination the matter is the one and only imposition of the Bishop's hand which takes place in the rite of that Ordina-

tion. The form consists of the words of the "Preface", of which the following are essential and therefore required for validity: *Emitte in eum, quaesumus, Domine, Spiritum Sanctum, quo in opus ministerii tui fideliter exequendi septiformis gratiae tuae munere roboretur.* In Presbyteral Ordination the matter is the first imposition of hands by the Bishop made in silence, but not the continuation of that same imposition by the outstretching of the right hand, nor the last imposition to which are joined the words: "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remissis peccata etc.". The form consists of the words of the "Preface", of which these are essential and therefore required for validity: *Da quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hunc famulum tuum Presbyterii dignitatem; innova in visceribus eius spiritum sanctitatis, ut acceptum a Te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineat censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinuet.* Lastly, in Episcopal Ordination or Consecration the matter is the imposition of hands made by the consecrating Bishop. The form consists of the words of the "Preface", of which these are essential and therefore required for validity: *Comple in Sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam, et ornamenti totius glorificationis instructum coelestis unguenti rore sanctifica.* All these things, however, are to be done as laid down in Our Apostolic Constitution, "Episcopalis Consecrationis", of November 30, 1944.

6. Lest any occasion should be given for doubt We command that the imposition of hands in conferring each Order be made by physically touching the head of the Ordinand, although even moral touch be sufficient for the validity of the Sacrament.

Finally, what We have declared and ordained above regarding the matter, and the form is not to be understood as permitting the least negligence or omission in the other appointed rites of the "Roman Pontifical"; on the contrary We order that everything which is enjoined in the same "Roman Pontifical" be carefully observed and carried out.

The dispositions of this Our Constitution have not retro-active force; should any doubt arise, it is to be submitted to the Apostolic See.

These things We ordain, declare and decree, everything whatever notwithstanding, even if it be worthy of special mention, and therefore We wish and order that these same things be made evident in some way in the "Roman Pontifical". Let no man therefore presume to infringe this Constitution given by Us or rashly dare to contravene it.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, on the thirtieth day of November, feast of St. Andrew the Apostle, in the year 1947, the ninth of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

MOTU PROPRIO

*on the concession of faculties to priests to hear confessions
while on an aerial journey.*

PIUS XII POPE

For the good of souls several Local Ordinaries have suggested to the Apostolic See that it would be well to extend to journeys by air the terms of Can. 883 of the Code of Canon Law regarding sea voyages. Knowing that journeys by air are daily becoming more frequent and wishing that the faithful should have the advantages envisaged by the said Ordinaries, whose zealous desire is worthy of all praise, We make their wish Our own, and with great joy of soul, of Our own proper motion, with certain knowledge and with mature deliberation, by the plenitude of Apostolic power We ordain and decree that what Canon 883 lays down concerning the faculty granted to priests to hear confessions on sea voyages be available and be extended on the proper conditions to priests journeying by air.

What We have decreed in these Our Apostolic letters issued by Our own proper motion, We will to be firm and valid in perpetuity, everything to the contrary notwithstanding; moreover We order that it have force from the date of the publication of these Letters in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the 16th day of December, 1947,
the ninth year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

*

*

*

*

SACRED CONGREGATION DE PROPAGANDA FIDE
DECREE

*on the administration of Confirmation to seriously sick
persons in danger of death.*

Subsequent to the decree of the S.C. of the discipline of the Sacraments beginning with the words: *Spiritus Sancti munera* and dated Sept. 14, 1946 (*A.A.S.* 38, p. 349), many requests came to this Sacred Congregation of Propaganda from Mission Ordinaries that these and still wider faculties be given to them.

These requests, as reported by the undersigned Cardinal Prefect, our Most Holy Lord Pius XII by Divine Providence Pope graciously deigned to receive.

In consequence His Holiness now grants to all Ordinaries depen-

dent on the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide (without prejudice to other indults which they enjoy in the matter) power to give to all priests subject to them and having the care of souls the faculty to administer Confirmation validly to the faithful, whether they be adults or infants, who are found within the boundaries of their missionary territory and are in danger of death. They lawfully administer the same Sacrament in the same circumstances of danger of death even in the place of the episcopal residence, if no Bishop is present or being present is lawfully impeded—the form given in the Roman Ritual being observed.

His Holiness ordered the present decree to be drawn up and published.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, on the 18th day of December, 1947.

P. Card. FUMASONI BIONDI, *Prefect.*

C. Costantini Archiep. Theodos., *Secretary.*

* * * *

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES ADMONITION

It has been reported to this Sacred Congregation of Rites that some persons led by excessive zeal are still working amongst the faithful and amongst Religious Communities to promote the cause of the beatification of the Servant of God Guy de Fontgalland. Hence this Sacred Congregation of Rites makes it publicly known that from the year 1941 it communicated to the promotors that this cause must be definitely laid aside. Wherefore those whom it concerns are admonished to abstain hereafter from any further action in this matter.

December 18, 1947.

C. Card. MICARA, Bp. of Velletri, *Prefect.*

A. Carinci, Abp. of Seleucia, *Secretary.*

* * * *

PAPAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION.

LETTER

to His Eminence Emmanuel Celestine Suhard, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church of the title of Sant' Onofrio, Archbishop of Paris: on the date of the Pentateuchal documents and on the literary classification of the first eleven chapters of Genesis.

My Lord Cardinal,

The Holy Father has graciously entrusted to the Papal Biblical Commission the examination of two questions recently submitted to His Holiness. They concern the sources of the Pentateuch and the historicity of the first eleven chapters of Genesis. These two questions, with their relative considerations and objectives, have been subjected to very attentive study by their Reverences the Consultors and their Eminences the Cardinals Members of the said Commission. As a result of their deliberations His Holiness in an audience accorded to the undersigned on January 16, 1948, has deigned to approve the following response.

The Papal Biblical Commission is pleased to pay tribute to the sentiment of filial confidence which inspired this step, and desires to correspond by a sincere effort to promote biblical studies, assuring to them, in the limits of the traditional teaching of the Church, the fullest liberty. This liberty has been affirmed in explicit terms by the Encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* in which the Pontiff now gloriously reigning thus expressed His mind: "The Catholic exegete led by an active and courageous love of his science, while sincerely devoted to our Holy Mother the Church, must not in any way refrain from facing again and again the difficult questions which still remain unsolved, not only for the purpose of repelling the objections of adversaries, but also with the aim of seeking a solid explanation in perfect accord with the doctrine of the Church, especially with that of biblical inerrancy, and at the same time capable of satisfying fully the certain conclusions of secular science. The efforts of those valiant workers in the vineyard of the Lord deserve to be judged not only with fairness and justice but also with perfect charity. Let all the other children of the Church remember this. They should avoid a zeal which is anything but prudent—a zeal which thinks that it must attack or suspect everything that is new". (*A.A.S.*, 1943, p. 319.)

It will be well to understand and interpret in the light of this recommendation of the Sovereign Pontiff the three official responses already given by the Biblical Commission regarding the above-mentioned questions, namely, that of June 23, 1905, concerning narratives which would seem to have only the appearance of history, occurring in historical books of Sacred Scripture (*Ench. Bibl.* 154), that of June 27, 1906, concerning the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch (*Ench. Bibl.* 174-177), and that of June 30, 1909, concerning the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis (*Ench. Bibl.* 332-339). It will be seen that these responses are not at all opposed to a further examination

(according to genuine scientific methods) of these problems in the light of results attained during the last forty years.

In what concerns the composition of the Pentateuch—in the above-mentioned decree of June 27, 1906—the Biblical Commission recognised already the lawfulness of the opinion that Moses “in the composition of his work used written documents or oral traditions”, and likewise recognised the lawfulness of the admission that the Pentateuch contained modifications and additions later than the time of Moses (*Ench. Bibl.* 176-177). At the present day there is no one who doubts the existence of those sources, and no one who refuses to admit a progressive growth of the Mosaic laws due to the social and religious conditions of later times, a progressive movement which manifests itself also in the historical narratives. Nevertheless, even in the camp of non-Catholic exegesis very divergent opinions are professed to-day touching the nature and the number of those documents, their characterization and their date. There are not wanting authors in different countries who for purely critical and historical reasons, without any apologetic intention, resolutely reject the theories hitherto most in vogue and seek the explanation of certain particularities of pentateuchal redaction not so much in the diversity of the underlying documents as in the special psychology, in the peculiar processes of thought and expression in use amongst Orientals and better known to us to-day, or also in the different literary mode required by the diversity of the matters treated. For this reason we invite Catholic scholars to study these problems without pre-conceived views in the light of sane criticism and in the light of the results of other sciences interested in those matters. Such a study will doubtless establish the great part and the profound influence of Moses as author and legislator.

The question of the literary forms of the first eleven chapters of Genesis is much more obscure and complex. These literary forms do not correspond to any of our classical categories and cannot be judged in the light of greco-latin or modern literary types. One cannot therefore affirm or deny their historicity wholesale without unduly applying to them the rules of a literary type under which they cannot be classed. If we agree not to see in these chapters history in the classical and modern sense, we must also admit that the actual scientific data do not allow us to give a *positive* solution to all the problems which these chapters set us. The first duty which is here incumbent on scientific exegesis consists first of all in the attentive study of all the problems—literary, scientific, historical, cultural and religious—connected with these chapters; then it would be necessary to examine minutely the literary pro-

cesses of ancient oriental peoples, their psychology, their manner of expressing themselves, and even their notion of historical truth; one should, in a word, gather without prejudice all the materials of the palaeontological and historical sciences, of epigraphic and literary remains. It is only thus that we can hope to see more clearly into the true nature of certain narrative passages of the first chapters of Genesis. To declare *a priori* that their accounts do not contain history in the modern sense of the word would easily give to understand that they contain no real history at all, whereas they relate in simple and figurative language, adapted to the intelligences of a less highly developed human population, the fundamental truths presupposed by the economy of salvation, giving at the same time a popular description of the origins of the human race and of the chosen people. While waiting for further light, we must practise patience which is the prudence and wisdom of life. This is what the Holy Father inculcates likewise in the Encyclical already cited: No one, he says, should be surprised that all difficulties have not yet been clarified or solved... That is no reason for losing courage. We must not forget that in human knowledge it cannot be otherwise than in nature itself. In nature whatever begins grows by little and little, and the fruits are gathered only after long labours—We can therefore hope that (these difficulties) which to-day seem most complicated and most stubborn will at last one day open themselves up to the full light, thanks to constant effort. (*ibid.*, p. 318).

Kissing the Sacred Purple with sentiments of profound veneration
I profess myself,

Your Eminence's humble servant,

James M. Vosté, O.P.

Secretary of the Papal Commission for Biblical Studies.

*

*

*

*

FACULTY GRANTED TO THE ORDINARIES OF NEW ZEALAND
AND AUSTRALIA CONCERNING THE EUCHARISTIC FAST.

N.9569/47

Beatissime Pater,

Ordinarii ditionum v.d. "Nuova Zelanda" et
"Australia", ad pedes S.V. provoluti, humiliter facultatem
postulant dispensandi a lege jeunii eucharistici per modum
potus et medicinae, fideles sexagenarios adversa valitudine

laborantes, mulieres praegnantes et lactantes, infirmos in nosocomiis degentes necnon aegrorum ministros.

Ex Audientia Ssmi, diei 12 Januarii 1948

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa XII audita relatione infrascripti Card. Pro-Praefecti Sacrae Congregationis de Sacramentis, attentis expositis, Oratoribus facultatem dispensandi indulget iuxta petita, ter in hebdomada, dummodo quod attinet ad aegrorum ministros, agatur de nocturna adsistentia et grave adsit incommodum in servando jejunio, remota quacumque scandali et admirationis occasione, servato ab omnibus jejunio duarum horarum a potu non alcoholico.

Contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Praesentibus valituris ad triennium.

L.S.

(Firm.) B. CARD. ALOSII MASELLA

Pro-Praefectus

F. Bracci, Sec.

W. LEONARD.

The Calendar

It is quite likely that the United Nations Organisation may before long be considering proposals for a reform of our present Gregorian calendar. These are not new proposals. During the period between the two world wars there was a good deal of agitation for calendar reform. Much propaganda was carried on, particularly in the U.S.A., on behalf of one or other of the schemes proposed. The matter was referred to the League of Nations, which appointed a committee to consider it. After lengthy discussions the subject was shelved in 1937. The nations had more urgent problems on hand. With the advent of peace the question is now coming to the fore again. Some preliminary steps have already been taken. In July, 1946, a bill sponsoring calendar reform was laid before the U.S. House of Representatives. Early in 1947 a draft resolution in favour of calendar revision was introduced by the Peruvian delegation at a meeting of the Economic and Social Council of U.N.O. Up to the time of writing (September, 1947) neither bill nor resolution has yet been debated or voted upon. Reform of the calendar is a matter that affects everyone intimately. It is the aim of this paper to present the material required for forming an opinion on the question.

Before going into the proposed reforms, it is well to examine the origins and development of our present calendar and the various changes that have been made in it in the past.

A calendar is a form of time reckoning. All time reckoning is based on some recurrent natural phenomenon. Nowadays the vibrations of a quartz crystal afford the most accurate means of measuring intervals of time. Here we are concerned with more obvious occurrences, that have been observed by even the most primitive tribes, the day, the month and the year. Of these three time units, the month is the one that appears to most people as the least important. Many people even seem unaware that the month derives its name from the moon, and that it meant originally the time the moon takes to go through its phases, from new moon to full and back to new moon again. Most people, apart from a small minority, including astronomers, take no practical interest in the moon. The astronomer's life, indeed, is regulated by the moon; when the moon is bright most of his work on the stars becomes impossible and he can go to bed. But, in general, for a long time past, the vast majority of people in our urban civilisa-

tions knew or cared little about the changing phases of the moon. Yet to past generations the moon was so important that their whole life was regulated by the lunar month. We find, in fact, that practically every civilisation of which we have record developed in the first place a lunar calendar. Only much later were attempts made to adjust this calendar to the solar year.

A solar calendar was required to serve the needs of agricultural communities. For the sowing of crops it is not the phases of the moon, but the time and season of the year that matter. At first the length of each year was determined empirically, just as was that of the month. A common method used was the observation of what is called the heliacal rising of certain stars, for example, Sirius. A careful watch was kept for the first appearance of the star in the morning sky. That day, i.e., the day on which the star was seen to rise just before the sun, was taken as the beginning of the year. That would occur, of course, when the sun was in a certain definite position among the stars, in other words at intervals of what is called a *sidereal year*.¹ Mr. L. Austen, who has made a close study of the natives of the Trobriand Islands, has shown that they decide the time to plan their crops by the heliacal risings or settings of the Pleiades and other stars.² The Trobrianders are considered a primitive race, but it seems that they know more practical astronomy than most so-called educated people of our civilisation.

Trouble arose when attempts were made to adjust the lunar calendar to the solar year. The beginning of each month was determined empirically by observation of the New Moon (actually of the first visible crescent, which is a day or so after the astronomical new moon). The average length of such a month was 29.5306 days, so that a year of twelve such months equals about $354\frac{1}{2}$ days. This calendar is still used by the Mohammedans, so that 34 of their years equal 33 of ours,

¹Astronomers distinguish different types of year. In general the year is the period of revolution of the earth around the sun. More than one point of reference may be chosen for the position of the sun at the beginning of the year; hence arise the different kinds of year. If the year is considered to start when the sun is at a certain definite position among the stars, we get the sidereal year. The time the sun takes to move from this position among the stars back to the same position is a *sidereal year*. The interval from one vernal equinox to the next is called a *tropical year*. Owing to the precession of the equinoxes the position of the sun among the fixed stars at the vernal equinox is constantly changing, and the tropical year is less than the sidereal year. The tropical year is 365.242216 days at present. The sidereal year is 365.256374 days. The time the earth takes to move from perihelion (the point in its orbit nearest to the sun) back to perihelion again is known as the *anomalistic year*, which is longer than the sidereal year. The calendar is not concerned with this third type of year.

²Austen, L.: *Oceania*, 9,237 (1939).

and each month is continually varying in season. However, the general practice in Babylonia and elsewhere was to intercalate an extra month from time to time, so as to keep the months to fixed seasons of the year. These intercalations were made irregularly, according to the whim of the local ruler or priests.

Later on it was discovered by Meton in Athens (5th century B.C.) that the moon's phases recurred at the same time of the solar years after an interval of 19 years. In other words 19 tropical years are very closely equal to an exact number of lunations (235). In course of time in various countries the extra months were fixed according to this Metonic cycle.³

The Egyptians were the first to measure the length of the year. They found it to be $365\frac{1}{4}$ days. The year required for calendar purposes is the tropical year, for that is the year in which the seasons recur at fixed times. The tropical year at present equals 365.242216 days, and is very slowly decreasing.

Egypt was also the first country to fix the length of the year by law. Their year consisted of twelve months of thirty days each, plus five extra days. This calendar dates from remote antiquity. Of course the calendar slowly got out of step with the seasons, but it was only shortly before the Christian era that a correction was made by making every fourth year a leap year. This old Egyptian calendar is the one still used in Abyssinia.

This brings us to the beginning of our own calendar, which we inherit from Rome. The Original Roman calendar was a lunar one, the length of the month being at first determined empirically by the Pontifices, who also decreed the intercalary months. Julius Caesar introduced the first really scientific calendar in 45 B.C. He obtained advice from the Greek astronomers at Alexandria. Taking the length of the year as $365\frac{1}{4}$ days they evolved the ingenious idea of leap years, introducing an extra day every fourth year. At first the Roman authorities did not quite understand the scheme, and it was not until the

³It took the human race a very long time to work out a practical luni-solar calendar. Yet a very low form of life, the Palolo worm (*Palolo viridis*), regulates its activities very exactly by such a calendar. Each year at 3 a.m. following the third quarter of the October moon these worms appear in great numbers on the surface of coral reefs in the South Seas. The Samoan natives date their year from this event. On the morning after the third quarter of the November moon the worms appear again in small quantities, then not again until the following October. They actually follow a lunar calendar, which they adjust to the solar year in a 29 year cycle. Two intervals of 12 lunations are followed by one of 13 lunations, and the 29th year is also one of 13 lunations. These facts were first observed many years ago and are well attested.

year 8 A.D. that the regular Julian calendar really started. It remained the calendar of the western world until the Gregorian reform in the 16th century.

Since the tropical year is somewhat less than 365½ days, the calendar year got more and more out of step with the actual year, until by the 16th century it was ten days behind. In other words the vernal equinox fell a little earlier each year; in the time of Julius Caesar it fell about March 21, but by the 16th century it was about March 11. The discrepancy had been observed for a long time previously and the Catholic Church had at various times considered plans of reform. In the 15th century Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly and Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa had proposed such plans and the leading astronomer of the day, Regiomontanus, was called in by the Pope as adviser. Later on, at the beginning of the 16th century, the Pope asked Copernicus for his opinion on the matter. Copernicus replied that he thought it was better to wait until the necessary astronomical data had been determined more accurately.

Finally Pope Gregory XIII appointed a commission to report on the question. The leading expert was the Jesuit astronomer, Christopher Clavius, Professor at the Roman College. It was decided to bring the equinox back to the date it had at the time of Julius Caesar's reform, by dropping ten days from the calendar. The change was made in 1582. The day after October 4, 1582, was October 15. By dropping the leap year in century years, except when the year was divisible by 400, the average length of the calendar year became 365.2425 days, which is very close to the length of the tropical year. In fact it takes nearly 4,000 years for the difference to amount to one day. Thus the new calendar is very accurate from the astronomical point of view, and it has further very great advantage of being very simply arranged. Indeed we may conclude at once that there is no point whatever in trying to adjust the calendar more accurately to the tropical year. In fact any such attempt would be a retrograde step, for it would be bound to introduce a more complicated rule instead of the present very simple one. Nevertheless proposals have been made in recent years for making such a change. Not long ago it was suggested that we drop a day from the calendar now, thereby ensuring that it would be correct in 4,000 years' time. This suggestion was made, not by a crank, but by a scientist in a high official position. Such proposals serve only to discredit the whole question of calendar reform.

The new calendar was promulgated by Pope Gregory in 1582. It was accepted at once in the Catholic countries. Violent opposition was

aroused in Protestant states, even though such leading Protestant astronomers as Tycho Brahe and Kepler welcomed the change enthusiastically. By slow degrees the opposition died down, but England did not adopt the new calendar for another 200 years. When the change was made in 1752, England had to drop eleven days from the calendar in order to fall in line with the rest of Europe. In Russia the opposition lasted still longer, owing to the objection of the Greek Orthodox Church to anything coming from Rome. It was Lenin who introduced the Gregorian calendar to Russia in 1918. Greece adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1923 and Turkey as late as 1927. Of course the existence of the two calendars side by side in Europe for so long caused much confusion. All this is not merely of historical interest. It conveys a warning to calendar reformers of the present day to proceed cautiously and to avoid sowing the seeds of conflict between peoples in a matter that should help to unite them.

Before coming to more recent attempts to alter the calendar, I must say something about the week, with which these changes are intimately concerned. The seven-day week is not a natural measure of time, such as the day or the month. At the same time it appears to have been originally not just an arbitrary number of days, but a convenient division of the lunar month into four quarters. In very early days in Babylonia it would appear that each month was thus divided, leaving of course one or two extra days in each month, or making some weeks of eight days instead of seven. At any rate there is no evidence of a regular seven-day week proceeding in unbroken sequence in Babylonia until very late in its history. Now the Jews did have such a week from time immemorial, so that it is hardly correct to speak of the Jewish week as being borrowed from Babylonia. Of course some form of week may have been common to all the Semitic peoples, but that is a different matter. At any rate the ultimate origin of the seven-day week is obscure. It is quite clear, however, that our present week is derived from the Jews. It was taken over by the early Christian Church and was very soon adopted officially in Rome in place of the original Roman eight-day week.

Whether the seven-day week corresponds to some natural rhythm in man, or whether it has become more or less essential to us by a very long tradition, it now forms so intimate a part of our western civilisation that it seems quite futile to attempt to do away with it. That is shown clearly by the complete failure of such attempts in the past. The French revolutionary calendar, introduced in 1792, abolished the week. It

made the year consist of twelve months of thirty days each, plus five extra days. Each month was divided into three periods of ten days, called decades. The people refused to accept the change and it was officially abandoned in 1805. The Soviet Government made a similar attempt in 1929, when a five-day week was introduced. The people in general continued to keep the seven-day week, and in 1932 a six-day week was started. This also did not work, and in 1940 an official return was made to the seven-day week.

The present movement for reform started in a small way shortly before World War I, and was of course interrupted by that war. In 1923 the League of Nations began to take an interest in the matter. A committee was appointed to examine the many plans that were proposed, some hundreds in all, and to ascertain the views of the various Government and religious authorities. Of all the hundreds of plans only two need to be considered here; only these two received any considerable support. The International Fixed Calendar League, founded by an Englishman, Mr. Moses Cotsworth, advocated a year of thirteen months of twenty eight days each, with one supplementary day not included in any week, so that each date would fall on the same day of the week each year. The World Calendar Association proposed a year of four equal quarters, the first month of each having thirty one days, the other two months thirty days each, the last day of the year being an extra day, not in any week or month. In Leap Year a similar extra day would be inserted after June 30. January 1st each year was to be a Sunday. Common to both these plans is the aim of a perpetual calendar, with a given day of the month falling on the same day of the week each year. In the 13-month calendar each month is of equal length. In the 12-month calendar there are four quarters of equal length. In both cases it is claimed that accounting would be much simplified, and that business and industry would benefit considerably. It is obvious how great a simplification would be introduced into the ecclesiastical liturgy by a perpetual calendar.

Both these reform movements attained full momentum only some years after the League of Nations started to discuss the question. Behind each movement were big business interests. Chief supporter of the 13-month calendar was the multi-millionaire, George Eastman. With the help of American money and organising ability both systems were given wide publicity in many countries. After Eastman's death in 1932 the 13-month scheme gradually lost ground. In any case it was strongly

opposed, as being too radical, by many who were ready to support the rival plan. At the present day the only plan of reform that is assured of wide support is that of the World Calendar Association. It is this plan that is embodied in the drafts now before the U.S. Congress and the Economic and Social Council of U.N.O.

Of all the proposed perpetual calendars this is the one that makes least alteration in the present calendar. The length of six of the months would be altered—February (28 to 30 days), March (31 to 30), April (30 to 31), May (31 to 30), August (31 to 30), December (31 to 30). There is nothing sacrosanct about the present length of the months. They are quite arbitrary, and there seems to be no good reason why they should not be altered, if it is advantageous to do so, and if there is general consent to the change. People whose birthday falls at present on March 31 may not like to have it on April 1. Well, they can take March 30, the new last day in March, instead. I do not hereby imply that sentimental reasons should carry no weight in the matter. Our celebration of such anniversaries as those of birthdays and of great national events rests on sentiment if you like, but it is not to be decried on that account. But the point is that we cannot expect our anniversaries to occur at precisely the same instant of the solar year each time. It would be ridiculous to expect such exact correspondence. In any case, previous innovations, such as leap years, prevent any such meticulous accuracy, quite apart from the fact that there are, as already pointed out, various kinds of solar year. The essential point about anniversaries, whether personal or national or religious, is that they remind us of whatever event is in question, and it is quite immaterial whether their recurrence is exactly every 365 days, or a day or two more or less. Consequently the proposed alteration in the calendar does not introduce any real difficulty in that respect.

A more thorny question is the fact that the sequence of the seven-day week would be broken. The Jews have observed that sequence for their Sabbath from very early times. It is an important point in their religious observance, and orthodox Jews in general have opposed the reform on that account. The Seventh Day Adventists are with the Jews on this point. It is of course quite impossible to introduce a perpetual calendar and at the same time maintain unbroken the sequence of the week. It would seem that, if the reform were carried out, orthodox Jews would have to hold their Sabbath independently of the new calendar. The difficulties of such a course are obvious.

The Hindus have a 7-day week, imported from the West about the fifth century A.D. It is an essential part of their calendar and is bound up with their religion. It appears that there would be violent opposition in India to a break in the continuity of the week.

There are those who assert that they prefer the variety provided by our present calendar to the sameness of a perpetual calendar in which a given date falls on the same day of the week every year. Another objection, raised by historians, is more substantial, though of course not so serious as the religious objections of Jews and Hindus. With our present calendar the very fact that a given date falls on different weekdays in successive years makes it possible at times to find the year in which an event took place if we know the day of the month and the weekday. For instance, from 1927 to 1942 April 25 is a Sunday in 1937 only, so that, if we know that an event occurred on Sunday, April 25, some time from 1927 to 1942, we know that the year must be 1937. It is said that in the Hindu calendar one can in a similar way pick out one particular year in four centuries. A perpetual calendar would of course deprive historians of this aid.

When the League of Nations committee sought the opinion of religious authorities on the proposed reform and on the question of the stabilisation of Easter, the chief and most downright opposition encountered was that already mentioned. The attitude of the Christian Churches generally was that there was no doctrinal objection to the change. The Greek Orthodox Church, the Church of England, as well as other Protestant Churches, were quite willing to accept the reform if there were general agreement on the matter among the various Churches. The Holy See stated that a decision would not be reached on the question of a fixed Easter until a General Council had discussed the matter.⁴

⁴The official reply from the Holy See to the League of Nations is contained in a letter from the Apostolic Nuncio in Switzerland, Archbishop (later Cardinal) Maglione, dated Berne, March 7th, 1924: "The Holy See notes with satisfaction that the League of Nations has explicitly recognised that the question of the reform of the Calendar, particularly so far as it concerns the fixing of Easter, is a pre-eminently religious question, and that any changes which might be made in this direction, though they would meet with no difficulties from the point of view of dogma, would nevertheless involve the abandonment of deeply rooted traditions from which it would be neither legitimate nor desirable to depart, except for weighty reasons connected with the general interest."

"The Holy See does not, however, consider that there is sufficient reason for changing, in regard to the fixing of ecclesiastical feast-days, notably that of Easter, what has been the perpetual usage of the Church, handed down by immemorial tradition and sanctioned by councils from early times. Even if, therefore,

Furthermore the official attitude of the Catholic Church appears to be that it will not make a move until it is clear that there is fairly general agreement among the nations on the question of reform. This cautious attitude may perhaps be due, at least partly, to memories of the violent opposition aroused when a Pope last sponsored a reform of the calendar.

In 1937 the League of Nations Communications and Transit Committee sent to the Governments of 69 countries a draft Convention, proposing the World Calendar described above, and asking for the views of the Governments. 24 Governments did not reply. Of the 45 replies received, 14 were in favour of the reform, 6 were opposed, 9 were not ready to reply, and 9 had nothing to say.⁵ With only 14 Governments out of 69 in favour of reform, obviously the League could do nothing more at the time. From that time on the world was otherwise engaged and no official moves were made in the matter until those mentioned at the beginning of this paper.

Closely connected with the proposed reform is the question of a fixed Easter. It has been referred to only incidentally in this paper, and I do not propose to go into the matter here. The question of the date of Easter has a very long and involved history. In the early centuries of Christianity it sometimes aroused violent controversy. The stabilisation of Easter was actually proposed and discussed at the time of the Gregorian reform of the calendar, but it was decided to drop the proposal. That was probably a very wise decision. There was violent enough opposition to the Gregorian reform as it was and a further controversy about Easter would have made matters still worse. It is clear at any rate that this is a question that concerns the Christian Churches and will have to be left to them for decision. That is the

it were shown that some change in these traditions was demanded for the general good, the Holy See would not be prepared to consider the question except on the advice of an Oecumenical Council". Translation taken from the official League of Nations Report on the Reform of the Calendar (Geneva, 1926), p. 85.

⁵The British Government replied to the League on April 22, 1937, as follows:—"The Government of the United Kingdom are of the opinion that any consideration of the draft Convention would be premature pending further discussion of the principle involved in the reform of the Calendar and of the particular method of reform to be adopted. They consider that the time will not be ripe for any further examination of the matter by the League until propaganda by those in favour of the alteration of the Calendar has achieved more widespread and solid results than it has hitherto. His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom remain of the opinion that, until the fixation of Easter has been achieved internationally, no useful purpose is served by attempting to proceed with the larger question of calendar reform". (*Journal of Calendar Reform*, 12, no. 4, p. 127, 1942).

attitude of the World Calendar Association. That has also been the official attitude of the British Parliament, which, in 1928, passed a Bill approving of the stabilisation of Easter, if and when the Churches agreed to it.⁶

D. O'CONNELL, S.J.

⁶The official League of Nations Report on the Reform of the Calendar (Geneva, 1926) contains the following declarations (p. 36) :—

9¹. From the point of view of dogma, strictly speaking, the idea of the reform of the calendar, both with regard to the fixing of Easter and the more general question of the reform of the Gregorian Calendar, does not meet with difficulties of such a nature that they can be regarded beforehand as insuperable;

2. It was unanimously agreed that no reform of the calendar, and in particular no decision regarding the fixing of Easter (a question which is essentially a religious one), is practicable without an agreement between the various high religious authorities concerned;

3. That the changes in existing conditions involved by any reform are only justified and acceptable if definitely demanded by public opinion with a view to an improvement of public life and economic relations".

N.B.—Father O'Connell wishes to draw attention to the following misprints in his article, *A.C.R.*, January, 1948, pp. 34-35 :—

Page 35, paragraph 2, line 4. For "(any tenths)" read "(and tenths)".

Page 36. In the paragraph giving Canberra as an example a line of MS was omitted in printing. Starting 12 lines from the bottom of page, the text should read: "If you want the latest time for midnight of January 20, you find from Table 1 that on that date local apparent midnight is 11 minutes after local mean midnight. Local mean midnight is 4 minutes after standard time midnight (for you are 4 minutes west of the meridian), therefore....."

Dom Hugh Connolly — In Memoriam

With the death of Dom Hugh (Richard) Connolly, Monk of Downside, on March 16 of this year, a distinguished Australian scholar of international reputation, but too little known in his native country, passed from the learned studies, which for 50 years he had pursued with remarkable results, to a better life. Some tribute to his memory and achievements is due from this chief ecclesiastical publication of the land which gave him birth.

Richard Joseph Connolly (the future Dom Hugh) was born at Werajel, near Carcoar, N.S.W., on July 12, 1873. His parents were Nathaniel Connolly (descended, it is said, from a soldier who served under Wellington) and Catherine Heydon, a sister of the late Judge Heydon and of the late Louis Heydon—the latter well known as a pillar of the St. Vincent de Paul Society here in its early days. A younger son of Nathaniel Connolly named Francis is still living at Bendick Murrell, N.S.W. A niece of Dom Hugh is superioress of an Australian Convent of Mercy, and two grandnephews are studying for the priesthood, one in Rome and one at Springwood; but that is only part of the meritorious history of the Connolly stock. The saintly Dr. Polding had stayed with them on one occasion and, possibly, under the good Providence of God, this explains some or many of the blessings which followed the several Connolly families sprung from the old home at Werajel.

Richard is remembered by one of our informants as a homesick boy at St. Stanislaus' College, Bathurst. This must have been about 1887, when he was 14 years of age. In the April of the next year, 1888, he arrived at Downside, with no great knowledge of letters, it is said, and still ignorant of cricket. He became good at both, even while he was yet in his teens.

The native ability of the rather backward boy, coupled with an industry, which was to be so fruitful in his future field of painstaking work, quickly won through, and he passed the London matriculation with marked distinction in 1891. That year his Benedictine vocation manifested itself. He took the habit of religion at Belmont in Septem-

Note: My very sincere thanks are due to the *Downside Review* and to members of the Connolly family in Australia. Without the information contained in an article which appears in the current July number of the *Downside Review*, under the signature "Monachus", this article could not have been written. The Editor, through the kind offices of Dom Bernard Orchard, Headmaster of Ealing Priory School, graciously sent me advance proofs of that article, together with a bibliographical list.—W.L.

ber, and was solemnly professed in January, 1896, in the middle of his 23rd year.

October of that year saw him at Cambridge as a non-collegiate student, but within a few months he had entered Christ's College, where he was to form a life-long friendship with Joseph Armitage Robinson, who probably directed his mind to early Christian literature, with Francis Crawford Burkitt, already a Syriac and N.T. scholar of note, and with J. F. Bethune Baker, whom Dom Hugh was afterwards to help in Nestorian studies.

It was—strange to say—in the theological faculty that Hugh Connolly read at the Protestant University of Cambridge, a choice which was to end in the unexpected result of his becoming an outstanding specialist in Syriac. This result came (also a bit strangely) through his deliberate selection of Hebrew as a language in which he thought he could excel. I have heard it said, but cannot verify the fact that he was the first Catholic cleric to take a degree in Cambridge since the Reformation. If so, this would have been in the year 1899, the year of his ordination to the priesthood.

In 1903 he visited Australia. His mother was still alive. I have been told that one of the things he did here was to baptize the above-mentioned niece who is now a Reverend Mother. In mentioning the fact, however, I have no intention of questioning St. Augustine's emphatic and Catholic assertion that the efficacy of baptism is entirely independent of the merits of the baptizer. The baptism performed then is just a sacred and treasured memory which the Connollys hold of Dom Hugh's first and last visit to Australia.

In 1904 Father Hugh succeeded Dom Cuthbert Butler as Superior of Benet House, the Downside House of Studies at Cambridge. During some seven years in this post he built up the scholarship in the Syriac and liturgical fields, and also the scholarly methods which were the power behind his subsequent work and which established his reputation as an Orientalist in the University of Cambridge. From 1911, during some years, he was lecturer in Syriac at Christ's College, examiner in the Oriental Language Tripos, a member of the Board of Oriental Studies, editor of some of the Cambridge "Texts and Studies"; and he also did editorial work for the "Texts and Translations' Society".

After the death of his great friend, Abbot Ramsay, and the appearance in 1929 of his book, *Didascalia Apostolorum*—itself dedicated to the memory of his deceased friend—overwork took its toll on Dom Hugh's health, and for a time he was badly invalided. I remember hearing even

in 1939 that he was far from well, but though very infirm he did much remarkable work during the war years, of which something presently. Ranking as titular Prior of Canterbury since 1939, he seems to have wonderfully revived his old interest in works of scholarship in the last septennium of his life. During the war he proved—very satisfactorily, it appears—that the work *De Sacramentis* and a treatise entitled *Explanatio Symboli* belong to St. Ambrose. The second of these works was his last major subject of study, so that the Creed explained by St. Ambrose may be said to have supplied the intellectual oil to the lamp of his strong Catholic faith as he ended his pilgrimage. A heart attack took him away at St. Mary's Hospital, Bristol, about the time of first Vespers of St. Patrick. Requiescat in pace.

Dom Connolly began to publish in 1901. His first listed contribution was to the *Journal of Theological Studies*, founded the previous year under the editorship of Bethune Baker and the liturgiologist Brightman. Dom Hugh's article was on Job 34: 20. Between that year 1901 and 1948 he wrote some thirty scholarly pieces for this important periodical. I have the long list of them before me. They deal with a variety of subjects: Syriac literature, liturgical texts, and critical problems in Patristics. I have also before me what was perhaps Dom Hugh's last contribution to the *Journal* and probably one of the last things he wrote. It is a note on a passage of Eusebius (H.E. V, 28); and in the review section of the same issue (January-April, 1948) he gives a pleasing account of a recent work of Father de Ghellinck, S.J. (*Introduction et compléments à l'étude de la patristique*, 1947). This review seems to be typical of Dom Hugh. He has a word of assent and dissent where the author touches his own special competence and a balanced appreciation of the whole book. He evidently treated all his tasks—even that of reviewing books so often acquitted with much easy laxness—with the same meticulous conscientiousness that he brought to larger critical and literary questions.

Little can be said here of the above mentioned long list of articles. Let it suffice to state that some of them are so important—for instance those referring to the Didache, the Epistle of Barnabas, the works of Hippolytus, and the writings vindicated for St. Ambrose—that they cannot be omitted from the bibliographies of any scientific Patrology.

Dom Hugh's contributions to the *Downside Review* were also numerous. They dealt mostly with monastic things, such as "Early Rules for Syrian Monks" and with liturgical matters, in which the influence of Edmund Bishop (the great lay liturgiologist---*but animo mona-*

chus) is discernible. Dom Connolly did his share to maintain the scholarly quality of the *Downside Review*. Consequently the very memory of this distinguished Australian seems to compel us to say here that this valuable Review, now in its 76th year, is too little known or, perhaps we should say, *lamentably unknown* in this country. Whatever hyperbole this complaint holds seems justifiable and justified.

Father Connolly wrote rather little for continental reviews. We find only one article of his (on fragments of an East-Syrian Liturgy) listed from Baumstark's *Oriens Christianus*, one (on some of the Notae of the Leonine Sacramentary) from the *Revue Bénédictine* of Maredsous, one (on the early Syriac Creed) from Hans Lietzmann's *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

In his books Dom Connolly showed his mental calibre at its best. He had a keen gift for minute analysis, a most delicate scientific sense in regard to accuracy, and wide linguistic knowledge. These he applied with an industry, courage, and tenacity which did not "refuse labour", however hard it might be, in the pursuit of facts.

Unfortunately, I have not access just now to Bethune-Baker's *Nestorius and his Teaching* (1908), to which Dom Connolly contributed an appendix and translations from the Syriac. My recollection of it from student days is that it propugned the conclusion that Nestorius was not a Nestorian, the book being regarded in consequence as a sort of libel on the Council of Ephesus. It was, of course, based on the famous Book (or Bazaar) of Heraclides of which Bedjan's edition did not yet exist and of which there was no English translation in 1908. In any case Dom Hugh had no responsibility for the thesis of the book. He just helped the author with his Syriac and Oriental learning.

The first book which was the learned Benedictine's own labour was a collection of the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, which appeared in 1909 in Cambridge "Texts and Studies". As Narsai is not likely to be known to many of our readers, we should mention that he is one of the "Fathers" of the Persian-Nestorian Church, which Church gives him the title of "Harp of the Spirit". From 437 he was head of the famous school of Edessa (where the genuine "Harp of the Holy Spirit", St. Ephraem had taught during the last 10 years of his life). Driven from Edessa on account of his Nestorianism, Narsai at the invitation of the Metropolitan Barsumas passed to Nisibis, where he founded the Persian Nestorian School in 457. Counting out an interruption of his activities during five years, he was head of this school for some 40 years, dying at Nisibis in 503, at the age of 103. Nestorian documents of those times

are very important, for Nestorianism, whose great adopted Doctor was not Nestorius but the highly-gifted and "rationalistic" Theodore of Mopsuestia, had many able and ardent scholars as well as remarkable missionaries during several centuries after the beginnings of its break-away from unity: Narsai wrote classical Syriac, and is chiefly celebrated for his poetry and poetic discourses. We do not perhaps find it easy to imagine Syrian preachers preaching metrical sermons, but it was so. After all the Muse of epic poetry is also the Muse of eloquence; and Cardinal Spellman recently showed us how pleasing speeches in free verse may be.

Dom Connolly's next work as an editor of Syriac texts was for the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, a collection not to be confounded with the *Patrologia Orientalis* of R. Graffin and F. Nau now numbering some 30 volumes, nor with the *Patrologia Syriaca* (Graffin), in which only 3 or 4 volumes appeared. The CSCO, as it is called, which has been appearing in Paris since 1903, under the direction of J. B. Chabot, Iganzio Guidi, H. Hyvernat, B. Carra de Vaux, J. Forget, has 4 different series: Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic (some 100 volumes). For the Syriac series Dom Connolly edited between 1911 and 1913 an "Exposition of the Offices of the Church", by an anonymous author. The edition of the Syriac text appeared in two parts (1911, 1913), and was followed by a Latin translation, also in two parts (1913, 1915). Meanwhile he had edited and translated for the "Texts and Translations' Society" (jointly with H. W. Codrington) two commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy, with early fragments of the Syriac Liturgy of St. James.

In 1916 came a work which perhaps more than any other has given Dom Connolly international fame, namely the work in the series "Texts and Studies" entitled *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents*. Let me here quote from the article kindly forwarded to me by the editor of the *Downdside Review*: "In this work Fr. Hugh tackled a problem of comparative documentary criticism for which he was well fitted not only by the cast of his mind acutely analytical and meticulously accurate, but by his linguistic interests—for the documents under review were in Greek, Latin, Ethiopic, Coptic, and Arabic. The problem was of a type familiar to students of the Synoptic Problem presented by the first three Gospels, and Fr. Hugh's solution of it, accepted by Harnack in 1920, and now universally admitted, involved the immensely interesting corollary that the Church Order in question is none other than the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (Rome, third

century), and as Harnack said, 'The richest source we have for the life of the primitive Roman Church'. This conclusion had already been adumbrated by Achelis, but the fact was not known by the English scholar, to whom the acceptance of the correct solution by the scholarly world is mainly due".

Just a few notes to explain this statement. In the Christian Museum of the Lateran Palace there is a celebrated marble statue of that fiery and ambitious man, Hippolytus, who ruled as antipope over a small but influential community at Rome during the pontificates of Calixtus, Urban, and Pontian. Exiled to Sardinia together with Pope Pontian, he was reconciled, and died in conditions which earned for him the honours of martyrdom. The marble cathedra on which he is seated in the Lateran Museum is inscribed with a Paschal Table and a long list of his writings (all in Greek). Amongst these titles is an "Apostolic Tradition"—a church order written for his schismatic community about 220 A.D. This *Apostolic Tradition* was lost but has been found, not in Greek but in other languages—unless it has come to light very recently. Dom Connolly's now universally accepted identification of the Tradition with a Church Order, which was known from Coptic, Ethiopian, and Arabic translations and only very slightly from a fragment of a Latin translation, gives us a most interesting glimpse into the life of a Christian community in Rome at the beginning of the third century. That is the special importance of Dom Connolly's publication of 1916.

Another almost contemporary Church Order, the *Didiscalia Apostolorum*, was also given to English readers by Father Connolly in a volume of some 360 pages published in 1929. The original was Greek, written, it seems, by a Bishop of North Syria in the first half of the third century. The document survives completely in an early Syriac version and partially in fragments of a Latin version. Dom Connolly translated the whole Syriac text and gave in their places, opposite the relative English translation, the Verona Latin fragments which, like most early Latin translations, are scrupulously faithful. Ninety pages of introduction treat all important questions touching the document. This volume was published by the Oxford University Press.

The earliest of all Church Orders, the precious little *Didache*, discovered at Constantinople by the Metropolitan Bryennios in 1873, also received the attention of Father Connolly, who returned to the subject again and again in article, note and preface. Briefly, he and Armitage Robinson satisfied themselves that Hermas the author of the *Shepherd*

used the so-called letter of Barnabas, and that the author of the Didache used both. The state of the controversy they raised is at present thus. While many are ready to accept the chronological order Barnabas, Didache, several scholars of great name still refuse to admit the dependence of the *Didache* on the *Shepherd* of Hermas. This means practically that they refuse to date the *Didache* later than 150.

Some manuscript works of Dom Hugh still remain unpublished. A finished essay on *De Sacramentis* will probably be printed in the near future, and a critical edition of the *Explanatio Symboli* is to appear in Cambridge "Texts and Studies".

Dom Connolly was by no means a voluminous writer—a Didymus Chalkenteros with 3500 tomes to his credit, or a Delisle who could point to 2000 publications. He wrote carefully and he wrote well. He often complained how difficult he found it to compose, but we wonder who doesn't find work difficult in which facts have to be constantly verified and the imagination kept under strict control so that the facts are given exact verbal expression. Dom Hugh's literary output both in quantity and more especially in quality does entitle him to a place in the illustrious group to which Aidan Gasquet, Cuthbert Butler, and John Chapman belonged.

W. LEONARD.

The Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate

The Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate offers a practical and powerful solution towards the problem of the restoration of Family Life. Unfortunately, in this country, very little or nothing is known of a movement which in U.S.A. numbers 88 Guilds in 22 Dioceses and 32 States of the Union. Readers of the A.C.R., therefore, will perhaps welcome an outline of the Movement taken from documents recently received from the official Promoter of this Apostolate.

Briefly, Catholic Maternity Guilds are associations of Christian charity in which the Faithful cooperate for the promotion of the primary end of Marriage, the procreation and the Christian education of children.

Bluntly, this apostolate attacks the evil of contraception. Its method of attack, however, is not an open one, at least in the preliminary stages of its campaign. It is much more subtle. It seeks to remove the excuses for, and often, the causes of birth-control; then, through intense and active indoctrination, to build up a new reverence for Parenthood and Marriage.

Many reasons and causes are alleged for the practice of the evil of birth-control, but, as is well known, the most frequent and most popular is: "We cannot afford to have any more children."

To meet this excuse, the Maternity Guild Apostolate extends material assistance to the married of the lower income groups. The unique feature of this financial assistance, however, is that it is made possible by the joint efforts of those placed in similar circumstances. In other words, funds are accumulated in a parish or society through the contribution of all classes of the Faithful, *including those who need assistance*, so that no one can taunt them with receiving charity in the odious sense of the term. The Guilds, therefore, are self help—mutual help Cooperatives.

This is the primary idea of the Guilds, a fund in a parish to aid the married in difficult circumstances. The money for this fund is contributed by the parishioners themselves: it is administered by them: it remains in the parish; at least, it is used to defray necessary medical expenses incidental to childbirth, wherever these might be incurred.

But the problem of contraception is not altogether an economic one. Too often its practice is due to ignorance of, or deliberate contempt for the Laws of God and Nature.

Therefore, hand in hand with financial assistance and supplementing

it, the Guilds carry on a doctrinal apostolate. This begins when a Guild is founded; the associates form a nucleus, a cell, from which radiate the ideals and principles expounded in the Encyclical of Pius XI on Christian Marriage, for the Movement is nothing but the concrete expression of hopes and suggestions voiced in that papal letter. Doubtless, there are many channels by which the doctrine of the Church on Marriage and the Family are brought to the notice of the Faithful, but, here, again, is a unique feature—the doctrinal apostolate of Maternity Guilds is devoted ex professo, intensely and earnestly to the spread of the teaching of the Encyclical "Casti Connubii". This objective finds its expression in active propaganda, in Retreats, Group Discussions and Conventions.

Therefore, the end of this Movement is supernatural, the extension of the Kingdom of Christ, to lead souls to God. The means are financial assistance and cultural activity.

The value of such a scheme will be seen immediately by those priests who have long been seeking an effective remedy to offset the forces attacking the Christian Family. But can this scheme be put into operation? Yes, it can. A quotation from the General Statutes gives an indication of the method.

"The Faithful of both sexes, single and married, are enrolled in this association, erected as a PIOUS UNION, in the form of a 'SODALITIUM' or GUILD, that is, constituted in corporate form with a graduation of officers".

The use of these terms shows immediately that the Maternity Guild Apostolate is not a haphazard or indefinite movement, subject to the mercies of misguided laity. It takes its place as an Association approved by the Church, strictly subject to canonical legislation. A Maternity Guild is not a Confraternity or a Sodality, i.e., "in incrementum publici cultus erecta". No. It is a PIA UNIO—"ad exercitium alicuius operis pietatis aut caritatis erecta". Furthermore, it is a SODALITIUM (in English, A GUILD), because it is administered by a corps of officers graded according to duty and authority. The Moderator of the Guild in any place can only be the Priest, *ex officio*; the President, Vice President, Counsellors, and other lay persons who are to fill minor offices are elected by the votes of the Members of the Guild. Further, the Guild is established by the Priest with the consent and formal canonical approval of the Ordinary. It is governed by the regulations for Catholic Action and the prescriptions of Canon Law. (C. 691-700, and 707-719. C.J.C.)

It seems, then, that a Maternity Guild is just another parish Society?

The answer to this objection is a definite negative. Its explanation will bring out more clearly the function of a unique movement.

Sodalities and Confraternities engage in the formative work of the sanctification of their members. But, Maternity Guilds belong to the class of associations known as PIOUS UNIONS whose objects are works of zeal. They offer a Catholic Action objective of vital importance to the members of parish societies. Therefore, THE MATERNITY GUILDS CAN BE BUILT INTO ALREADY EXISTING SOCIETIES. In the case of an individual society, a simple method is to appoint a committee to study the Guild plan and then to offer it to the members as a work of zeal and charity; not, thereby, to interfere with, or widen the scope of their society, but to take full advantage of the *Persona Moralis* already existing, for the administration of the Fund of the Maternity Guild. For this, as has been said, is the primary idea of the Guild Apostolate.

On a wider scale, in the case of two or more societies, a general meeting may be called. The Guild Plan is explained and proposed for discussion. Each Society may then elect two of their number to serve on the Board of Directors of the Guild. Four of this Board are chosen as President, Vice-President, Secretary, and Treasurer. The Pastor is ex-officio Moderator of the Guild. The Treasury, the "Fund", will be kept separate from other parochial funds, as prescribed by Canon Law.

It is of interest to note here that the Guild scheme has proved itself so flexible and so successful that in many places in U.S., coordination and cooperation has been achieved not only with parish societies, but with Catholic Boards, Parent-Teacher Associations, Credit Unions, Hospitals and obstetricians. On the cultural and spiritual side the Guilds have been linked with parochial units of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and with various purely spiritual apostolates, especially the League of Saint Gerard Majella for Catholic Mothers. It is noteworthy, too, that Maternity Guilds have received wide approval from the medical profession, because the charity of the Guilds lessens the number of outstanding bills! (The Guild cheque is paid directly to the Family Member and not to the Hospital or Physician). One medico expressed himself thus: "Guilds such as yours make the so-called socialization of medical practice unnecessary". Surely a significant statement.

The National Catholic Women's Union, the women's section of the

Catholic Central Verein of America, has promoted the Catholic Maternity Guild Movement with commendable zeal and with marked success. In Australia we have similar, if smaller, but nonetheless powerful organisations of women such as the Legion of Catholic Women, and the Catholic Women's Social Guild. In the promotion of Maternity Guilds, in Australia, if I may be allowed to suggest it, these organisations of Catholic women would find a work wholly in conformity with their ideals for the uplifting of the status of women and for the good of society generally.

It is now time to pass from this summary drawn mainly from the General Statutes of the Movement to a few more particular considerations.

The authentic presentation of the Guild Plan is contained in the brochure, "The Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate", obtainable, together with directions for procedure, gratis, from the Central Bureau of the Central Verein, 3835 Westminster Place, St. Louis, 8, Missouri, U.S.A. The writer of this article, also, has a limited number of the brochures available for distribution.

It is to be noted and emphasised that this brochure does not contain the practical method of procedure in founding a Guild. It contains merely the principles of the Guild Plan. Nevertheless, only by the systematic study of these principles can the Guilds be successfully launched. For, while the General Statutes are the same for all, each individual Guild must draw up its own Constitutions and By-Laws adapted to particular local conditions. In some places difficulties were encountered because too much eagerness in founding Guilds led to the overlooking of important points. Hence the need of close study of the Guild Plan.

The drawing up of the constitution regulating the contributions of members is the most important work in the foundation of a Guild. It is necessary, in the first place, to avoid the implication of "Insurance", otherwise, the Guild will find itself subject to Government laws and its sphere of supernatural activity will be restricted. The Guild must not assume a contractual obligation to pay a specified amount of money in return for a fixed premium, namely DUES; all disbursements are made within the limits of the treasury, and no claims are allowed against the Guild. The true Guild-spirit is the spirit of charity, for the Holy Father Pius XI certainly had the supernatural objective in view, when he recommended "public or private Guilds", and "joint aid by those placed in similar circumstances".

The most satisfactory method of operation in regard to contributions has been found to have varying degrees of membership:—Founders or Patrons, Sustaining Members, Family Members. Founders and Patrons are men and women blessed with an abundance of temporal goods who contribute generously towards the treasury of the Guild. There are always a few who are willing to do this from a pure motive of charity. The Sustaining Members are those of lesser means inspired by the same motive. The Family Members are the actual recipients of this charity who contribute not only for their own benefit but also for other Family Members and for the deserving poor. Thus selfishness is ruled out and charity reigns. Fortunately, specimen copies of plans of successfully working Guilds are available for the guidance of those founding new Guilds, but, it is emphasised, there is no uniform particular Constitution: each Guild must adapt itself to local conditions.

Little has been said concerning the cultural activity of the Guilds. Stress has been placed, hitherto, on the Guild "Fund." Without contradicting the statement that this Fund is primary in the Guild idea, it is necessary to remember that the doctrinal apostolate is by far the more important. For the propaganda of the 'Planned Parenthood' advisers is so widespread and so insidious that he would be indeed ignorant of the way of the world who would deny that Catholics are uninfluenced by this propaganda or that they never succumb to it. Further, it is a fact, resting on authentic and communicable information, that there are Catholics who practise contraception and who are receiving the Sacraments regularly. These either consider that the practice is not a sin or that the prohibition is only "one more Church Law." There is surely need for active propaganda in favour of the ideals of the Catholic Maternity Guilds. It is true the Catholic Press condemns the evil of contraception, but, often, it does not "hit the nail on the head." Often, too, it remains ineffectual either because the faithful do not read what is written or because no constructive suggestions are offered.

But, a Maternity Guild in a parish is a veritable germ-cell of Catholic Action for this particular problem of the Christian Family. The executive of the Guild will naturally be the more fervent members of the parish societies. The Family Members, who, at least, are exposed to temptation, and the younger people looking forward to Marriage (these have always welcomed the Maternity Guilds) cannot but be influenced by the active example and energetic apostolate of the fervent. And the financial assistance that is offered, will be, as it were, a "draw" to bring them under that influence.

The use of the term "Maternity" Guild does not, of course, cover the whole scope of the Movement. It indicates only its initial endeavour. However, the designation "Maternity" is retained in the title of the official brochure referred to above, because it was by this that the Movement became known, and also because true maternal concern provides for the proper education of children, to which, also, financial aid, if necessary, is extended. Moreover, this term recalls the dignity inherent in the very idea of Christian Motherhood, sadly forgotten in this nearly pagan world. However, in choosing a title for a particular Guild, it is advisable to exclude this word "Maternity", because it will be misunderstood by men, by the single and those advanced in years. All these are eligible for Membership. The city-wide Guild in Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A., is called simply "The Family Guild of St. Gerard".

It is probably needless to say that discussion of the so-called "Rhythm Theory" is ruled out of Maternity Guild Conferences. To quote the strong words of one report: "Our Guilds are not counsellors of infecundity".

Finally, through the kind favour of this Review, I esteem it an honour to be able to record the name of a Confrere in Religion, Founder and official Promoter of the Maternity Guild Apostolate, Rev. J. J. Schagemann, C.S.S.R., veteran missionary, now in his 72nd year, who, for the past 15 years and more, has laboured indefatigably for the ideals of the Christian Family and the dignity of the Sacrament of Matrimony. His work bears signs of a rich harvest.

E. DUNNE, C.S.S.R.

Moral Theology

CATHOLIC NURSES AND CO-OPERATION IN ILLICIT OPERATIONS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you kindly give a solution of the following cases of co-operation :—

1. Can a Catholic nurse act as a theatre sister at an unlawful operation, such as craniotomy and others that directly cause the death of a child; and at any operation the sole object of which is sterilization? Her principal duties, I understand, are to prepare the instruments and hand them to the doctor during the operation.
2. Could she, in the absence of another doctor, give an anaesthetic for such an operation? She states it would be practically impossible for her to accept a position in a public hospital without sometimes meeting illicit operations.
3. Can a Catholic nurse give a mixture, ordered by the doctor, which she knows is given for the sole purpose of causing a miscarriage? Could she allow others working under her to do so?
4. Could she, as Matron of a Public Hospital, admit patients who enter for the sole purpose of undergoing an unlawful operation?

H.T.

REPLY.

There are no cases more confusing or more difficult of solution than those which depend, as do the questions submitted, on the principles of co-operation in the sin of another. The ground has been covered time and again; the statement of the principles seems comparatively easy; but their application is frequently unsatisfactory. Briefly, the principles may be stated thus: a) Formal co-operation in the sin of another is unlawful—always. b) Material co-operation is likewise unlawful—but not always, for it may be justified if there be sufficient reason.

The question of co-operation can be raised only with regard to external sins, for the purely internal workings of the mind and will of our neighbour are entirely his own. In an external human act—and sin is always a human act—we may distinguish two aspects: the act of the faculty which is in itself purely physical, possessing no morality, and the act of the will which is good or bad according to the way it corresponds to the moral law. The external act is not to be judged as of no consequence; it shares in the morality of the deliberate act of the will.

of the person who is responsible for it; but it must be insisted that sin formally consists in an act of the will. It is possible to help another to perform an act which is sinful on the part of both co-operators, because both desire to violate the divine law; and in this case the co-operator helps in the external act and also approves of the sin. It is also possible that an act done by Titius is evil because of the circumstances or the purpose for which it is done, while the same act done by Caius in different circumstances and for another end would be not only lawful but meritorious. If then Titius and Caius unite to do something not wrong in itself, but done for an evil intention by Titius and for a good purpose by Caius, is it impossible that Caius would not be guilty of sin while Titius certainly would be? If Titius and Caius are workmates and Titius engages in his trade all the week that he may have the wherewithall to indulge in a bout of intoxication while Caius toils to support his family, Titius' work is done for an immoral purpose and *ratione finis* is sinful, while Caius is doing good. They are both engaged on the same work, which for one is sinful and for the other innocent or meritorious.

Let us therefore hasten to declare that *formal* co-operation means two things: assistance in the external act of sin, and approval of the internal act of the will by which God's law is set at nought. *Material* co-operation is merely assistance in the external act without any approval of the sinful will from which it proceeded in the case of the other co-operator.

Having thus explained our terms, it is evident that the principles enunciated above are true. With regard to the first, to approve of the sin of another is to make an act of one's will which is inordinate, tending towards an object which is contrary to the moral law. The second principle in its first member—that material co-operation is unlawful—flows from the precept of fraternal charity, whereby we are bound to ward off harm from our neighbour if we can. The greatest harm that can come to him is sin, and by helping him to sin we are actually engaged in inflicting harm upon him. The remainder of this principle—that a sufficient reason will excuse or justify material co-operation—follows from the fact that the precept of fraternal charity may be in conflict with a law of higher consideration, v.g., the law of love of God, the laws of justice or even the law of charity towards ourselves. Thus a person would not be bound to commit sin in order to abstain from helping another; on the contrary he would be obliged not to offend God: neither would he be obliged to allow a third party to be deprived of his just rights; nor suffer any extraordinary inconvenience himself. All God's

material creatures are capable of being abused, and even the most laudable of human endeavours can be and have been availed of by the malice of men to further their own evil purposes. So true is this that, if we were to take cognisance of the sins in which we could have some material share, we could scarcely do anything. A chemist sells poisons, and a person with suicidal intent purchases a deadly mixture and with it takes his own life. The chemist is an innocent party to the suicide, but he is a co-operator without whom the crime would not have been committed. Must he discontinue to sell poisons? Obviously not, for he is entitled to make a living at an honourable profession; and poisons have so many useful purposes that he was justified, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to assume that his customer required what he purchased for something lawful. An employer knows that his employee will squander his wages; if he has no money he cannot commit certain sins. Never-the-less, the employer is bound in justice to pay the man his wages, and he is not responsible for the sins of intemperance or any others which may result. A priest knows from the confessional that a person at the altar rails is unworthy of holy Communion; he gives him Communion, for to refuse would be to break the seal of confession, even though, by communicating the sinner, he co-operates in the sacrilegious reception of the most blessed Sacrament. Thus it is seen that while material co-operation is generally unlawful, there are circumstances when it is not so.

The great difficulty is to know, in a particular instance, whether the co-operation involved is material or formal, whether the actions whereby we help our neighbour do or do not imply approval of his sin. There is one case, however, in which we can be sure that purely material co-operation is impossible, and that is when the action performed by the co-operator is intrinsically wrong. To do a thing which is wrong in itself can never be justified, and no end however desirable could make it so. So we must ever remember that in the question of lawful co-operation in the sin of another, our remarks are necessarily restricted to acts which are either good or at least indifferent in themselves. To hold a ladder is in itself an indifferent act: to hold a ladder to help a painter to ply his trade would be a good act; to hold the same ladder to enable a thief to enter a house to despoil the owner of his goods would be apparently an evil act, because at first sight it would imply an approval of the sin of injustice. But what appears at first sight is not necessarily true, and it may well be established that the man holding the ladder for the thief did so because he was forced under threat of physical violence or even worse.

It is usual to make a distinction between proximate and remote co-operation, and also between the various degrees of the urgency or gravity of the causes which might excuse material co-operation. In general, the rule may be laid down that the more proximate and necessary the co-operation, the greater the cause that is required to justify it. Our external actions do more or less express our interior state of mind--a fact which is accepted according to the maxim that our internal intentions are presumed to be reflected in our external acts, unless there is evidence to the contrary. If our co-operation substantially furthers the sinful act of our neighbour, the presumption is that we intend, when helping him, what he intends, and it would take some serious reason to convince a rational person—and incidentally ourselves—that the real purpose of our co-operation was otherwise. If there be no reason for our co-operation or an insufficient one, considering the gravity of the actions in question, the conclusion is that we too indirectly intend the sinful result of the joint act of ourselves and our neighbour. We help him to commit sin when we are bound by the law of charity not to do so; we are directly guilty of a sin against fraternal charity and indirectly responsible for the consequences of our transgression of this virtue.

After this summary exposition of the question of co-operation let us attempt to answer the questions of our correspondent. The answer in each case depends on three facts:

- a) Are the actions performed by the matron or nurse in themselves sinful or otherwise (at least indifferent)?
- b) Do they effectively and to a degree contribute to the procuring of the evil effect?
- c) Is there a sufficient and justifying cause?
 - a) The actions of the theatre sister in sterilizing instruments and handing them to the doctor are in themselves indifferent. They may well be compared to the holding of the ladder; for there are doubtless many lawful operations during which the same instruments would be used.
 - b) The assistance of the sister at the operation constitutes proximate co-operation, for without her help this operation would not have been performed.
 - c) Since she is a material and proximate co-operator, for a very serious reason she may, speculatively speaking, perform the tasks mentioned. The question however arises: is such a reason to be found? *Salvo meliore judicio*, we think there are two reasons, one private and the other public. There is the question of the nurse's own livelihood and the difficulty of obtaining another equally honourable and profitable position; and above that, there is the question of the public good, for it is undoubtedly in the public interest that among the mem-

bers of the nursing profession there should be a proportion of good Catholics, who in the course of their duties have many opportunities of healing not only the bodies but also the souls of those to whom they minister.

We said that "speculatively speaking", these actions may be done by the theatre nurse; but in practice the question of scandal always must be considered. It is scarcely likely that the doctor will be confirmed in his errors on the morality of these operations because of the actions of a nurse, but it is conceivable that other nurses and the patients themselves would conclude that, because a good Catholic nurse assisted at them, they must be free from blame. The element of scandal may perhaps be overcome, if the nurse lets it be known that she does not approve of such operations, and that she assists at them only under tacit protest.

2. Though the administration of the anaesthetic seems to be more closely associated with the illicit operation than the caring for the surgical instruments, and so more proximate co-operation, it still remains an indifferent action, which we think may be performed by the theatre sister, if she has no option. She should make it clear that her assistance implies no approval of such practices: she complies merely to avoid great evil.

3. This question has two parts. To the first: May a nurse administer a medicine the sole purpose of which is to bring about a miscarriage? we answer: No. To the second part: May she allow others working under her to do so? the reply is, with qualifications, she may allow them. To administer a mixture the sole purpose of which is to bring about an abortion seems to be an act, evil in itself which could never be lawful. As the saying is, the *finis operis* is evil and no protestations on the part of the one administering the medicine will make it otherwise. With regard to allowing another nurse under her to give the mixture, there is an obligation in charity to prevent it if possible, and a further and graver obligation which is here one of justice, not to order her subordinates to do what is sinful by violating the right to life of the unborn child. But if the doctor issues the orders and the assistant nurse obeys, it is difficult to see how the charge Sister is responsible.

4. Admission to a hospital is an indifferent act, and the Matron cannot very well refuse admittance to those who are instructed by the doctor to betake themselves to hospital.

These questions are necessarily treated here in a theoretical manner and we would be sorry if our answers were to have the effect of lowering

the moral standard of our Catholic nurses. Co-operation such as we have dealt with is material and proximate in questions 1, 2 and 4; it is formal in question 3. Formal co-operation, we repeat, is never permitted; material co-operation is lawful if there be sufficient reason. The nurse must be conscientiously convinced that she has no alternative but to comply. As a final remark it may be said that the nurse is not always competent to give a judgment on the morality of the operation, and in case of doubt she may rightly presume that there is not a violation of the moral law. Sterilization may sometimes be lawful, v.g., if it be a necessary means to save the patient's life.

* * * *

SOCIAL FUNCTION AND HELPING NON-CATHOLIC SECT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A parish priest was offered the free use of a privately owned local hall for New Year's Eve. There was to be a Ball held there, organised jointly by the committees from the Catholic and Anglican churches. The proceeds were to be divided equally between the Catholic and Anglican building funds. Could the parish priest accept?

QUAERENS.

REPLY.

There are two considerations which may cause the parish priest to hesitate before accepting this offer: co-operation in the spread of heresy, and scandal. With regard to the first, we think his conscience can be easy. The solution of the second worry would rest chiefly on local conditions.

The union of people of different religious convictions in a social function can be commendable. The only difficulty here seems to be that the proceeds are in part to be devoted to the building fund of the Anglican Church. Leaving aside the fact that the result of the efforts of the Catholics who help in the organisation and patronage of the function will be devoted as equitably as seems possible, to Catholic purposes, there are many other desirable results that could be expected from the function, and one could have these directly in mind and permit some incidental assistance to a cause which could not, if intended directly, have Catholic approval. Directly to help in the furtherance of any heretical body in its work of spreading heresy would never be justified; but we have no doubt that the co-operation in a social function such as described, whereby, in helping ourselves we also help the Anglicans to

embellish their church building, cannot be called directly propagating heresy.

The other consideration is more serious, and the parish priest might well weigh whether his action would be likely to have the effect in the minds of the people that there was no difference between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Church, as both are working together for the common welfare of Religion and one just as good as the other. It is a case where it would be best to bring all the facts before the notice of the Ordinary and abide by his decision.

* * * *

EX-COMMUNICATION INCURRED BY COMMUNISTS— RECONCILIATION OF APOSTATES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. If a Catholic becomes a Communist, does he incur excommunication?
2. What is the procedure for a Priest to whom a Catholic, now repentant for having joined the Communist party years ago, comes to confession?
3. In the *Australasian Catholic Directory*, 1948, pp. 86-87, a formula of abjuration of apostates is published. Would you kindly outline a few practical cases when this formula must be used.

LASSUS.

REPLY.

1. A person who accepts Communistic teaching and manifests his adherence to it in any way is *ipso facto* under the excommunication mentioned in Can. 2314 against apostates and heretics and schismatics, the absolution from which is reserved *speciali modo* to the Holy See. If he becomes a member of the party, we think he incurs another excommunication reserved *simpliciter* to the Holy See for joining an association which plots against the Church or legitimate civil authority (Can. 2335).

Schism, heresy and apostasy are various grades of defection from the unity of the true Church. They are defined in Can. 1325, par. 2. Schism is a rupture of charity; a schismatic refuses to be subject to the Supreme Pontiff or communicate with those who are. A heretic obstinately denies or doubts a truth which is to be believed on divine and Catholic faith, though he does not reject the name of a Christian; his is a sin against faith. An apostate rejects the Christian faith in its en-

tirety; he sins against faith and charity. There is no doubt that the Communist is a heretic, for he denies many of the divinely revealed truths which are taught by the authentic *magisterium* of the Church. The philosophy which underlies the Communistic system is rank materialism, opposed to all religion and to the very existence of God Himself. Whether persons who call themselves Communists are always aware of these fundamental errors, especially in the case of the poorly instructed, is a question which can be solved only by an interview with the individuals concerned. At any rate, we believe that it is sufficiently patent these days, even to the most ignorant, that the Catholic Church and Communism are so diametrically opposed that no one can adhere to Communism without denying thereby his belief in the divinely constituted authority of the Church—which is a revealed truth—and so committing the sin of heresy. Any external act which manifests this denial is the crime (*delictum*) of heresy to which is attached the *ipso facto* ex-communication of Can. 2314. If he really accepts the whole of the Communistic doctrine, he is of course an apostate, but the sanction for apostasy and heresy are the same.

Can. 2335 punishes with ex-communication those who become members (*nomen dantes*) of the masonic sect and other associations of the same kind which plot against the Church and lawful civil authority. Cappello (*De Censuris*, 1925, n. 298) maintains that sufficient similarity with the masonic sect is the purpose of plotting against Church or lawful civil authority. "It is of no consequence whether these sects are secret or public; whether they exact an oath of secrecy from their members or not. It is necessary and sufficient that from their purpose, or at least in fact, they plot against Church and lawful civil authority, or either of them, even though they profess to have some other purpose."¹ On the other hand, Noldin (*De Censuris*, n. 74) requires as a condition for the incurring of the censure, that the society joined should be organised on a system of secrecy and be governed by secret leaders; otherwise it is not of the same nature (*ejusdem generis*) as the masonic sect. Aertnys-Damen (*Theol. Moral.* 1947, Vol. II, n. 1057) admits as probable that socialists do not come under this excommunication, because they have not a secret organisation. Prummer (*Theol. Moral.* 1936, Vol. III, n. 516) is inclined to include socialists who actually conspire against lawful ecclesiastical or civil authority. It is probable, then, that

¹Bouscaren-Ellis (Canon Law, A Text and Commentary, 1946, p. 897) has: "The censure is incurred if the society is one which plots against Church or State, openly or secretly, whether members are secret or not, bound by oath or not. Cappello thinks Socialists are included. Communist party certainly is".

only secret organisations are covered by the excommunication of Can. 2335. Even if we accept this as the interpretation to be followed in practice, the communists would seem to us to be included. They have one set of leaders who appear in public, but take their orders from another source which remains well hidden; and their organisation and its ramifications are well guarded secrets. Thus we would say that a member of the Communist party is doubly excommunicated.

2. Having decided that a member of the Communist party is excommunicated, the question is what are we to do with him if he presents himself penitent at the confessional? Two difficulties arise: a) should he be absolved in the internal forum, seeing that his crime is public? and b) if he should or can be, what are the powers of the confessor over reserved excommunications?

a) If the penitent is disposed, he should be absolved from his censures by a priest who has the requisite faculties. This absolution given in the internal forum is *per se* not valid for the external forum in all its effects. An excommunicated person absolved in the internal forum may not conduct himself as free from censure, if by so doing he would cause scandal; and until such absolution is proved or can be legitimately presumed in the external forum, the superior can insist that the censure be externally observed. Thus, if our former Communist were to be seen approaching the sacrament of the Eucharist, and the other members of the congregation knew nothing about his reconciliation, they could be scandalised. He should not, therefore, publicly go to communion till it is known that he has made his submission to the Church; and the Bishop can insist that he be absolved in the presence of witnesses from his excommunication. Public absolution, however, is not always necessary; it is sufficient that he can prove his absolution which was given in the internal forum. This can be done by going to confession on some occasion when others are present who can testify that the penitent did approach the sacrament of Penance. When a former Communist comes to confession and is truly repentant he has a right to absolution from his censures as well as from his sins if the Confessor is competent to give it. The absolution from excommunication is for the internal forum only, but if it can be proved that absolution was given, then such absolution will suffice.

b) The confessor as such has not faculties to absolve from reserved excommunications. Here we have two, both reserved to the Holy See, one *speciali modo* and the other *simpliciter*. For the one special facul-

ties are required, for the second faculties to absolve from papal cases in general. The Australian Bishops have the faculty to absolve from both classes of excommunication, and they can subdelegate it to their priests. As we understand there are slightly different practices in various dioceses, each priest can know from his faculty sheet what are his powers in this matter. If the confessor who receives the confession of the penitent Communist has not habitual faculties to absolve him conferred by the Bishop, he obtains them per *modum actus* from law in two instances: in danger of death, and in case of urgency. The case before us does not seem to be one where the danger of death is verified, so we can confine ourselves to the possibility of the urgency. From Can. 2254, Par. 1, we learn that in more urgent cases, namely, when a censure *latae sententiae* (i.e., *ipso facto*) cannot be observed externally without scandal or loss of good name, or if it be difficult for the penitent to remain in the state of mortal sin for the time necessary to have recourse to the competent superior, then any confessor can absolve him from reserved censures, with the onus however of having recourse to the S. Penitentiary or the Bishop or some other Superior who has the faculties to absolve. Recourse to the superior must be made if possible, at least by letter and with the help of the confessor, and within a month—under penalty of incurring the same censures from which absolution was given. In many cases the conditions of the *casus urgens* will be verified, and the confessor who has not faculties to absolve from reserved excommunications receives them here and now from law. He must, however, warn the penitent of his obligation to have recourse to the proper superior within a month. If he knows of some priest who has faculties for these cases, it is sufficient to send him to this priest; or he may send him to the Bishop or write to the Bishop for him, using fictitious names and taking care not to break the sacramental seal.

Let us then suppose that the confessor has faculties from some source to absolve our Communist. What must he do? He must ask for a renunciation of his errors at least in a summary way, v.g., 'Are you now sorry for what you have done and do you sincerely believe in the Catholic Church and all she teaches?' He must demand that a complete break be made with the forbidden society, and extract a promise to repair the scandal given by assiduous attention to his religious duties in the future. He will also impose a suitable penance, grave in itself and to be fulfilled under a grave obligation.

3. The formula of Profession of Faith to be found in the Directory

would be used prior to the absolution in the external forum from the excommunication attached to the crime of apostasy, just as the shorter profession of Faith is prescribed before absolving converts from heresy. It would have to be read by a repentant member of the Communist party or any other person who had completely abandoned the Christian religion and was to be reconciled publicly, i.e., in the presence of witnesses.

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

I. MARRIAGES OF LAPSED OR NOMINAL CATHOLICS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In the course of my pastoral work I am often puzzled as to what is the correct procedure in arranging the marriage of a nominal Catholic. For instance, an intending spouse may be the child of a mixed marriage or of careless Catholics, baptized a Catholic but brought up with the minimum of instruction in the faith. He may not even have made his first Confession and Holy Communion. Again, there is the person baptized a Catholic but brought up without any religion. He may call himself a Catholic but in effect he has no religion. Then there are others who have fallen away after leaving school. Some years later such a one may wish to marry a practical Catholic. In effect it is the same as a mixed marriage. Some so-called Catholics have become Free-masons or Communists and are really hostile to the faith.

In these and similar cases should the priest regard a proposed marriage with a practical Catholic as a mixed marriage, exacting guarantees and seeking a dispensation? And what ceremonial should be employed in celebrating the marriage?

Sometimes, too, a Catholic who attends Mass occasionally but whose reputation is bad seeks the blessing of the Church on his marriage. Should the priest perform such a marriage even though he has no real hope of an amendment.

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

The impediment of mixed religion exists in the case of a Catholic and a member of a heretical or schismatical sect (Canon 1060). Therefore, if both parties to a marriage have been baptized Catholics and neither has joined a heretical or schismatical sect nor an atheistical society, the impediment does not exist. However, several classes of lapsed or nominal Catholics are enumerated in Canons 1065, 1066, and before marrying such parties the pastor must take special precautions. It will be necessary to set out a brief commentary on each of these Canons before considering individually the cases set out in the present query.

APOSTATES AND MEMBERS OF CONDEMNED SOCIETIES.

Canon 1065: 1. The faithful must also be deterred from contracting marriage with persons who have either notoriously abandoned the

Catholic faith, even without having gone over to a non-Catholic sect, or have notoriously become members of societies which have been condemned by the Church.

2. The pastor must not assist at the above-mentioned marriages without having consulted the Ordinary, who may in view of all the circumstances of the case permit him to assist at the marriage, provided there be a grave cause and the Ordinary in his prudent discretion judge that adequate measures have been taken to ensure the Catholic education of all the children and the removal of danger of perversion from the other party.

Two classes of lapsed Catholics are subject to the provisions of this canon:

(a) those who have notoriously abandoned the Catholic faith without having joined a non-Catholic sect,

(b) those who have notoriously become members of societies condemned by the Church.

The term "notoriously" has a technical value. A canonical crime may be notorious in law or in fact. It is notorious in law after judgment passed by a competent judge has become a "res judicata" (Can. 1902), or after confession made by the accused in a criminal trial (Can. 1750). It is notorious in fact—a matter of more usual application—when it is publicly known and has been committed in such circumstances that it is unconcealable by some subterfuge and inexcusable by any legal defence. This element of inexcusability requires that the person committing a canonical delict is popularly believed to have acted freely and with aforethought. This has important application in reference to ill-instructed Catholics.

APOSTATES IN CANON 1065.

These Catholics have (a) notoriously abandoned the Catholic faith and (b) have not joined a non-Catholic sect.

(a) An apostate is one who, after having received Baptism, has completely abandoned the Christian faith (Can. 1325, 2). Those who abandon the faith and publicly profess to be athetists, rationalists or "free-thinkers" fall within this category. It is not merely that one has abandoned the practice of religion—such a one may be amongst the "public sinners" of Can. 1066, it is, rather, that he has abandoned Christian beliefs. Those who openly reject some dogma of the Catholic faith, so that their apostasy is partial (more accurately, heresy) are also included.

(b) Sometimes it is difficult to establish whether an apostate has become a member of a non-Catholic sect. The law considers two ways of acquiring membership—by being formally inscribed as such or by publicly taking part in its activities (Can. 2314, 1, 3.) In some sects there is a formal procedure of admission and a register of membership may be preserved. In others there is no formal enrolment and membership is established by co-operation in religious practices.

It should be remembered that persons who belong or have belonged to an atheistic sect are to be considered, as to all legal effects, even those which concern sacred ordination and marriage, as persons who belong or have belonged to a non-Catholic sect. A Catholic who is really a member of the Communist party must be included in this category.

MEMBERS OF CONDEMNED SOCIETIES IN CANON 1065.

The usual application of this provision of law will be in regard to Catholics who have become Freemasons and whose membership is notorious. If a person frequents Masonic meetings or publicly wears the regalia and emblems or, in general, shows himself as a member of masonry, his membership is thereby to be considered as public. If a person is suspected of being a mason and after prudent investigation the doubt remains, it follows that, at least, his membership is not notorious, and he is not included in the provisions of Canon 1065.

CANON 1065 DOES NOT ESTABLISH AN IMPEDIMENT.

Canon 1065 does not declare a matrimonial impediment between faithful Catholics and members of the two classes just considered. The faithful are to be deterred from marrying such persons, if they refuse to amend. If such efforts are ineffectual the pastor must seek not a dispensation from an impediment but permission to assist at the marriage.

In practice the Ordinary will deal with the application in much the same way as an application for dispensation from Mixed Religion or Disparity of Cult. He must consider the circumstances of the case and be satisfied of the presence of a grave reason—which will be similar to the canonical cause for a dispensation. Further, he must judge according to his own prudent discretion that suitable measures have been adopted to safeguard the Catholic education of the offspring and to avert danger of perversion from the faithful Catholic. As in the case of a mixed marriage, he must be *morally certain* of these conditions, as they are required by divine law. In dealing with mixed marriages the formal guarantees are required as a means of acquiring this moral certainty.

They are not specified in Canon 1065, but the Ordinary may deem it necessary to exact suitable undertakings. It is to be recommended, of course, that some measure of ante-nuptial instruction be given, as to a non-Catholic, insofar as prudence dictates.

Should the banns be called? In Canon 1022 the general rule is laid down that the pastor is to announce publicly who are about to contract marriage. Exceptions to the rule are marriages of conscience (Can. 1104) and mixed marriages (Can. 1026). Therefore, the conclusion is that the banns should be called in the case of these less worthy Catholics. But the Ordinary may dispense from the calling of banns for a just cause and the scandal likely in these cases would seem reasonable grounds for seeking a dispensation.

PUBLIC SINNERS AND EXCOMMUNICATES (Can. 1066).

Canon 1066: If a public sinner or one who is notoriously under censure refuses to go to sacramental confession or to be reconciled with the Church before marriage, the pastor must not assist at his marriage unless there be a grave reason, regarding which he should if possible consult the Ordinary.

A public sinner is one whose sinful conduct is publicly known, e.g., one who is publicly known to have lived in concubinage or to have been convicted of grave charges.

Matrimony is a sacrament, so that a person who is under excommunication or personal interdict should not be admitted to receive or administer it. Furthermore, as a sacrament of the living it should be received only by those who are in the state of grace. A public sinner must receive sacramental absolution and a person under censure must be reconciled with the Church before approaching the sacrament of matrimony. If they refuse to comply with this law the priest may perform the marriage for a grave cause, concerning which he should consult the Ordinary, if possible.

In this canon the worthy reception of the sacrament seems to be the first consideration. However, whenever there is danger to the faith of the faithful spouse or the offspring, suitable safeguards should be sought. Concerning banns the remarks regarding Canon 1065 may be applied.

CEREMONIAL OF MARRIAGE.

It is not easy to lay down a general rule as to what ceremonial should be employed in marrying the lapsed Catholics of Canons 1065, 1066. Each case should be considered on its merits.

Marriages of Catholics should be celebrated in the parish church

,Can. 1109, 3). On the contrary, marriages between a Catholic and a non-Catholic party are to be celebrated outside the church, unless the Ordinary considers it prudent to dispense (Can. 1109, 3). It follows that marriages of unworthy Catholics should take place in the church. If scandal is foreseen as a result of similarity with a mixed marriage the Ordinary may dispense from the general requirement in accordance with paragraph 2 of the same Canon.

Canonists are not in agreement concerning the ritual to be observed. Again, the law contains a general rule that, outside a case of necessity, the rites prescribed in approved ritual books or sanctioned by laudable custom must be observed (Canon 1100); also that the parties should receive the solemn nuptial blessing (Can. 1101). The only specific exception is the case of mixed marriages (Can. 1102).

Applying the general rule some canonists would permit all the sacred rites, even including the Nuptial Blessing. Others, relying upon earlier replies, would maintain that sacred rites, particularly the Nuptial Blessing, are forbidden.

In finding a practical solution the possible scandal to the faithful must be considered. For this reason it may be found preferable to exclude Nuptial Mass. On the other hand the observance of the other sacred rites may impress upon the lapsed or unworthy Catholic the loss which he has sustained.

QUERIES OF PAROCHUS.

If the *freemason* is notoriously a member of this condemned society, in the sense explained, he is governed by the provisions of Canon 1065. If the *Communist* is really a member of the party and not just a sympathiser, he is to be classed as a member of an atheistical sect and his marriage to a Catholic will be a mixed marriage. Concerning the Catholic "whose reputation is bad", it should be determined whether he is a "public sinner", so that he would be included in Canon 1066.

PASTOR writes, too, of some who "have fallen away after leaving school". These may be apostates in the sense of Canon 1065. However, it may be that they have given up the practice of religion without abandoning their faith. In this case they may be public sinners in the sense of Can. 1066. If they are neither apostates nor public sinners the priest's duty is to exhort them to receive worthily the sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion and, at least, to procure for themselves the state of grace by eliciting an act of perfect contrition.

NOMINAL CATHOLICS.

The other types of Catholic described by Pastor are outside the

scope of the canons considered above. He instances the Catholic, baptized but ill-instructed, who has never received the other Sacraments. His marriage with a Catholic is not mixed, because he is not a member of a non-Catholic sect. Nor is he an apostate or public sinner as understood in this context, as it is not his own neglect which is responsible for his lack of religious knowledge. There is an application of Canon 1020, 2, which directs the pastor to enquire in the course of his pre-nuptial investigation, whether the parties are sufficiently instructed in Christian doctrine. Also, Canon 1033 applies, in which the pastor is directed to exhort the parties to receive worthily Penance and Holy Communion.

Likewise he refers to a nominal Catholic, baptized, but brought up without any religion. Sometimes such a person declares tenaciously that he is a Catholic, sometimes he is uncertain of his designation. Such a person is not a notorious apostate even when he has ceased to designate himself as Catholic. For he is not one who is known publicly to have abandoned the faith deliberately and with knowledge of the moral guilt. Nor is he a public sinner, since he is not personally responsible for his lack of instruction. Again there is scope for Canons 1020, 2 and 1033.

If such persons refuse to receive instruction or if they refuse to prepare for the Sacraments what should be the pastor's attitude? He may not refuse to assist at the marriage. The Code Commission has declared that if Catholic parties refuse to receive instruction with a view to remedying their ignorance of Christian doctrine they are not to be regarded as public sinners and the pastor should not, on that score, refuse to assist at their marriage. Likewise, if they refuse to prepare for the Sacraments, he may not refuse to assist at the marriage. The law of the Code requires Sacramental Confession only in the case of public sinners and of those notoriously under censure. (Can. 1066).

*

*

*

*

II. FACULTIES TO HEAR CONFESSIONS AT SEA.

In the last issue of the *A.C. Record* (April, 1948) a query was proposed concerning the faculties of a religious to hear Confessions at sea. He had been granted the faculties of the diocese in which his religious house was situated until such time as his superiors should transfer him to a house of another diocese. He was transferred to a post overseas and travelled by ship to his destination. Was he empowered to hear Confessions at sea in virtue of Canon 883?

In reply it was stated that "actual possession of faculties to absolve conferred by one of the Ordinaries named in Canon 883 is a necessary condition for acquiring faculties to absolve at sea. Therefore, supposing that Father Titius had not obtained faculties from another of the Ordinaries listed he did not acquire faculties to absolve in terms of Canon 883, seeing that the faculties granted by the Proper Ordinary had expired".

The following correspondence has been received by the Editor of the *A.C. Record* :—

Dear Rev. Father,

.... In the question asked on page 134 we read : "The faculties were granted until such time as his superiors should transfer him to a house situated in another diocese. It was clearly understood that his faculties were to expire on leaving the diocese". In the answer, page 135, we read : "Therefore, supposing that Father Titius had not obtained faculties from another of the Ordinaries listed, he did not acquire faculties to absolve in terms of Canon 883, seeing that the faculties granted by his proper Ordinary had expired".

But, may I ask, Is not this conclusion too sweeping? If Father Titius had been stationed in a house in a diocese (e.g., Sydney) from the port of which he is to travel by ship to his new station (e.g., Wellington, N.Z., or Manila P.I.) (his "proprius ordinarius" is also the ordinary of the port of embarkation in Canon 883) do his faculties "expire on leaving the diocese (page 134) *when he actually goes aboard or when the ship has left territorial waters*. In either case it must be admitted that Father Titius has the faculties of Canon 883. For if *going aboard or embarkation* is the beginning of the sea journey, but the expiry of his diocesan faculties he has faculties by Canon 883. If the diocesan faculties expire only when the ship leaves territorial waters, then he has begun his sea journey (in territorial waters) and so has the faculties of Canon 883.

In the case of Father Titius leaving an inland or other than embarkation diocese (e.g., Ballarat) surely Noldin-Schmitt in Vol. III, *De Sacramentis*, Ed. 1940, page 350, in n. 344, 2b would give Father Titius some hope : "et quamvis delegata relicto territorio expiret, tamen sufficit, ut sacerdos, usque dum domicilium suum relinquat, eam habeat nec revocatione amiserit".

When having laboured as a priest for some time I left Eire for Rome for special studies, the Pope was my Local Ordinary for the years I was in the Eternal City. I did not receive faculties during my scholas-

tic sojourn there. When arrangements were being made for my coming to Australia, my religious superior in Rome asked the Vicariate for faculties for me that I "might be able to enjoy the faculties of Canon 883", when I embarked at Marseilles, France. The Vicariate granted me diocesan faculties "provided they were not used in Rome and solely that the benefit of Canon 883 might be availed of in the circumstances of the petition".

In conclusion may I say that the answer given in the current (April) number of the *A.C.R.* is too severe? Perhaps Canon 209 (even Can. 207) would help the doubtful.

DIDYMUS RELIGIOSUS.

The solution of this question depends upon the correct interpretation of the clause, "dummodo facultatem rite acceperint confessiones audiendi". DIDYMUS RELIGIOSUS bases his opinion of the case on the interpretation of "acceperint" in the sense that the priest must have faculties from one of the Ordinaries specified at the moment of commencing the voyage by sea. The solution with which he disagrees is based upon an understanding of "acceperint" in the sense that the priest not only possesses faculties at the moment of commencing the journey, but retains them throughout the journey.

If the canon is to be understood in this sense it means that DIDYMUS RELIGIOSUS possessed the diocesan faculties of the diocese of Rome throughout the trip to Australia. They ceased when his journey by sea was concluded, as the intention of the Cardinal Vicar or his representative was to grant them only for as long as they were necessary for this purpose. This was plain from the injunction that they were not to be exercised in Rome.

Which interpretation of "acceperint" is correct? In support of the interpretation adopted in the last issue of the *A.C. Record* the following argument is proposed.

The possession of faculties granted by one of the Ordinaries of Canon 883 is evidently meant to be a test of fitness of a priest to receive the faculties of that canon. Surely the logical assumption is that this test of fitness should persist during the entire period of possessing those faculties. Otherwise, too, the anomaly could obtain that a proper Ordinary might withdraw a priest's faculties to hear Confessions while the journey was in progress on account of some unworthiness, while the priest would still retain the faculties of Canon 883.

In confirmation of this argument it may be observed that in some of the documents cited in the *Fontes* of the Code as sources of the present

law, the present tense is used, e.g., "dummodo a proprio Ordinario Confessiones excipiendi facultatem *habeant*" (H.O. 9 Apr., 1900), "facultatem *habeant vel obtineant*" (H.O. 23 Aug., 1905).

MAJOR SUPERIORS OF EXEMPT CLERICAL INSTITUTES.

In the reply given in the last issue of the *A.C. Record* a reply of the Code Commission concerning Major Superiors of exempt clerical institutes and the faculties of Canon 883 was overlooked. Such superiors, although designated as "Ordinaries" according to Canon 198, are not included under that term in Canon 883.

FACULTIES TO HEAR CONFESSIONS WHILE TRAVELLING BY AIR.

It is appropriate to record an important extension of Canon 883 which was made by a "Motu Proprio" of 28 January, 1948. The faculties of Canon 883 to hear confessions at sea are extended in analogous circumstances (*consentaneis quidem clausulis*) to priests making a journey by air.

Applying the terms of Canon 883 it follows that any priest making a journey by air possesses the faculties provided that he has faculties to hear Confessions *either* from his own Local Ordinary *or* the Local Ordinary of the diocese in which is located the aerodrome of departure *or* from the Local Ordinary of the diocese in which is located any aerodrome at which the plane calls *en route*. The extent of the faculties obtained is firstly that throughout the journey the priest may hear the Confessions of any of the faithful travelling with him; *secondly*, when the plane has stopped at an aerodrome *en route* he may hear the Confessions of those who come aboard the plane or of those who ask him even when not aboard the plane, absolving them validly and licitly from cases reserved to their own Ordinary. This latter faculty—to hear the Confessions of those who approach him—is valid for a period of not more than three days while he is waiting to resume his journey.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

THE EXTRAORDINARY MINISTER OF CONFIRMATION.

Our readers will remember the Decree of the S. Congregation of Sacraments, dated 14th September, 1946, which was given in translation in the issue of the *Record* of April, 1947, whereby the Holy See granted to territorial parish priests and certain others, who were expressly mentioned, the faculty to administer the sacrament of Confirmation within their territory, to those who were in danger of death through sickness. In the present issue will be found a Decree of the S. Congregation of Propaganda in virtue of which the Ordinaries in places dependent on this Congregation may give to any priest subject to them the authority to administer Confirmation, as the extraordinary minister, to infants or adults who are dangerously sick.

It may be useful to make the following observations on the text of this Decree.

1. It does not give to priests the Faculty to administer Confirmation; but empowers the Ordinaries to grant it. In this it differs from the Decree of the S. Congregation of Sacraments, which appointed parish priests (and others who were included) as extraordinary ministers of Confirmation, without the intervention of the Ordinary, but by direct concession from the Holy See. Should the parish priest of the parish of X administer Confirmation to a dying person within his parish without previous reference to the Ordinary, who is certainly not available, the sacrament is both valid and lawful; but if the assistant priest or a parish priest outside his territory were to perform the same rite, it would be invalid and sinful, unless he had the faculty, either habitually or *per modum actus* from the local Ordinary.

2. The faculty may be conferred not merely for the territory to which the priest is attached, that is for one parish or district, but for the whole of the Diocese, Vicariate or Prefecture. Thus it bears an analogy to the faculty to hear Confessions, which a parish priest has from Law for his own territory and by delegation of the Ordinary for the rest of the Diocese, etc., and an assistant possesses by delegation in every instance.

3. The validity of the sacrament does not depend on the fact that the Bishop is not about or not available. However, the faculty may not be used lawfully in the place of the episcopal residence, unless the Bishop is unable himself to confer the sacrament.

4. This Decree does not prejudice any faculties which the Ordinary may have from the Holy See with regard to empowering a priest to give Confirmation. The Australian Bishops already have the faculty to delegate one or other of their priests to administer this sacrament, not only to the sick, but to all who present themselves, in places distant from the Episcopal residence. By virtue of this latest Decree the Ordinaries of Australasia are enabled to solve in a practical way some cases where it was open to discussion whether certain priests were included in the concession made in 1946 by the S. Congregation of Sacraments; and in addition it goes far beyond what was then granted to the Universal Church.

* * * *

MASS WITHOUT A SERVER.

Dear Rev. Sir,

It frequently happens in small country places that the Sisters who teach in the local school are the only persons present at week-day Mass. During the school year, there is no difficulty, as the Sisters make the responses; but when the vacation comes round they depart for a few weeks, and usually no one turns up for morning Mass. Is the priest justified in giving the responses himself? Could he make a practice of saying Mass in this manner solely for the sake of devotion?

WESTERN PRIEST.

REPLY.

We think that priests in the circumstances described by our correspondent could say Mass without any one to give the responses once in a while, but to do so habitually would need an Indult from the Holy See which the Ordinaries of Australasia are empowered to give from their habitual faculties. The presence of a server at Low Mass is prescribed by the Rubrics of the Missal (*Ritus servandus, passim*) and also by Canon Law. The present discipline of the Church is expressed in Can. 813: "The priest should not say Mass unless he has a server who serves and answers him. The server at Mass should not be a woman, unless no male server can be had, there is a just cause, and with the provision that the woman stays at a distance to answer and does not in any way approach the altar". This law is ecclesiastical in origin; it is not imposed by our divine Lord, nor is it consequent upon the public nature of the act of sacrifice. The prayers of the Mass presuppose the presence of the congregation, and it is fitting that some person should be at hand to assist the celebrant by performing those actions which he can

attend to himself only with difficulty. Nevertheless, the priest at the altar is the public minister of the Church, even if nobody is present, and the act of sacrifice is always a public act much the same as the private recitation of the divine Office is a public prayer because performed in the name of the Church by a minister specially appointed for that purpose. Mass is valid without the server: it is valid whenever the form of consecration is pronounced over true wheaten bread and the wine of the grape by one who is in priest's Orders and has the intention of acting as the Church does. Mass said without a server is not lawful, and there is no doubt that the law requiring a server binds under pain of serious sin. Two things are to be done by the server: he is to serve and answer. If he can do one but not the other, the law is fulfilled in part, and it does not appear that it would be a serious fault to celebrate Mass with such an assistant. The canon cited above allows a woman to answer from a distance, for a just cause, and we see no reason why a similar cause would not justify a man to answer in the sanctuary and not serve, or serve only, if through want of knowledge he could not recite the responses.

It is sometimes permissible to celebrate Mass without any assistant, male or female, answering or serving, for no ecclesiastical law binds in case of necessity. The difficulty, however, is to determine when such a necessity is verified. There is no doubt that a sufficient reason would be to consecrate the blessed Sacrament to give the viaticum to the sick; and many other less cogent reasons are usually admitted: to enable the people to satisfy their obligation on Sunday or a day of precept, or the priest to fulfil his own obligation on a similar day; if the server takes his departure after the priest has commenced the Mass and he does not return within a reasonable time. In all these and similar instances there is evidently some necessity to proceed with the celebration of the holy Sacrifice, but what is to be said for the case submitted? Is devotion alone a justifying cause? Cappello (*De Sacramentis*, Vol. I, n. 703) states that it is, if otherwise the priest would be compelled to omit Mass altogether. This author argues that the fact that the Holy See frequently grants an indulst to celebrate Mass without a server, not only in missionary countries but even in Europe, is an indication that the discipline of the Church in this matter is much milder than formerly. To a certain extent, we concur, for the custom of daily Mass is nowadays practically universal, and to a priest the omission of his Mass even on one morning means a great spiritual loss which he realises cannot be recovered. To-day more than ever he needs the strength and comfort

he derives from his Mass to continue in the fight for faith and virtue, especially his own virtue. So we are of opinion that if unexpectedly it happens that there is no one present who can serve or answer, and it is not practicable to go in search of a server, he may presume permission and celebrate alone. We would not say, however, that he could continue in this practice. His first care would be to ensure that somebody would regularly be present to assist him at Mass, and if that were impossible then to apply for an indulst to say Mass without a server. The fact that the Holy See grants the dispensation is a sure argument that the law of the Missal and the Code is not a dead letter, and if mere devotion were sufficient reason constantly to disregard it, it would have no force left at all, for devotion alone is only vaguely connected with the idea of necessity. The Australasian Ordinaries in the *Pagella* given them by the S. Congregation of Propaganda, 1st January, 1941, for ten years, are empowered to permit that Mass be said without a server (*sine ministro*, n. 4); and we suggest to "Western Priest" that he submit the case to his Bishop.

We may remark that when saying Mass with no one to answer, the priest makes all the responses himself, just as he is accustomed to do in the private recitation of the Office. He says the *Confiteor* only once, with the omission of the words *et vobis, fratres* and *et vos, fratres*, and with the appropriate changes in the *Misereatur*; he says *manibus meis* for *manibus tuis* in the response to the *Orate, fratres*: and if there be no one to serve, he places the cruets, etc., handy (on the right hand side of the altar) before commencing, shifts the book himself and in general performs as conveniently as he can what is usually done by the server.

*

*

*

*

TONES OF VOICE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. In what tone of voice should the *O sacrum convivium* be recited after distributing Communion outside Mass?
2. In what tone of voice should the priests say the *Amen* after the *Pater Noster* at Mass; and also is there any authority for wiping the paten before the *Amen*.

PETRUS.

REPLY.

1. Since the responses made by the celebrant at the conclusion of the *O sacrum convivium* are to be answered by the server, it is reason-

able to suppose that these and the antiphon should be recited in the loud tone. This is the teaching of the authorities on the rubrics. O'Kane (Ch. XII, p. 360, n. 685) writes: "He (the Priest) is to say all aloud, according to De Herdt, and as may be inferred from the rubric which requires the minister to respond". Likewise O'Connell (The Celebration of Mass, vol. II, p. 170): "Then he (the Priest) begins aloud (for the server is to answer) the antiphon *O sacrum convivium*".

2. The *Ritus servandus* at the beginning of the Missal (X.I) directs that the *Amen* after the *Pater Noster* be said *submissa voce*: the rubrics of the Canon have: *Sacerdos secrete dicit Amen*, though the older Missals, i.e., before the edition authorised by Pope Benedict XV. had *secrete* after the festal music of the *Pater Noster* and *submissa voce* after the ferial notes. O'Connell (op. cit., vol. II, p. 110) maintains that the *Amen* is said in the subdued, or middle, voice and adds in a footnote that most rubricians follow that. He also remarks that some prefer to follow the direction of the rubric in the *Canon Missae* which is *secrete*. L. J. O'Connell (The Book of Ceremonies, Milwaukee, 1944, p. 95) has: "When the server has answered *Sed libera nos a malo* say *Amen* in a low tone", and he has defined "low tone" on p. 65; it should be heard by the priest himself. On the same page he identifies the *vox submissa* and the *vox secreta*. Baldeschi (Rome, 1922, p. 31), Zualdi-O'Callaghan (Dublin, 1937, p. 113), Menghini (Le SS. Cérémonie, Roma, 1921, p. 171) all hold that the *Amen* should be said secretly. As there does not appear to be unanimity among the authorities, neither practice can be called wrong: we may adopt either the secret tone or the middle voice for the *Amen*. Our own opinion is that it should be said secretly. The expression *submissa vox* can be and is understood sometimes as the medium voice as opposed to the loud tone, but *secrete* is never used to direct the priest to speak in the middle voice. The rubrics then usually have *vox aliquantulum elevata* or even *submissa vox*.

2. The rubrics and the rubricians leave no doubt that the wiping of the paten should take place after the priest has answered the *Amen*.

JAMES MADDEN.

FUNERAL RITE FOR A PRIEST.

In the Roman Ritual (Titulus VI., cap. I, "De Exsequiis") we read that Parish Priests should with the utmost zeal foster and retain the use of the sacred ceremonies which our holy Mother, the Catholic Church, has received from ancient tradition and from the institution of

the Supreme Pontiffs and employs for the burial of her sons, as mysteries of religion, signs of Christian piety and salutary suffrages for the faithful departed. If it be the desire of the Church that the funeral rites should be carried out with all possible perfection and care in the case of every one of her members, how greater is her wish that when a priest lays down this mortal burden his obsequies be carried out with all solemnity and exactness. There is happily a tradition in the Australian Church that the burial of a priest is made as becoming a function as lies within the power of his brothers in the Priesthood, but it may happen that on occasions, for want of ready and detailed information, the ceremony is bereft of some of the beauty which accompanies the liturgical funeral service. We intend therefore to set forth in these pages a complete description of the ceremony of the burial of a priest, with attention to differences should the Bishop be presiding or celebrating the rite.

It is prescribed in Can. 447, par, 3, of the Code of Canon Law, that it is the duty of Vicar Forane, as soon as he hears of the serious illness of one of the parish priests of his district, to see that during his sickness he is provided with all spiritual and material helps and that after death he is given a decent funeral. It may be presumed that the parish priest would be bound to perform the same charitable offices for one of his assistants. Of course, the Bishop will have been informed and the other members of the clergy that they may celebrate Mass for the repose of the soul of their deceased confrère and take part in the funeral.

According to the Ritual the church bell should be tolled when a person has passed away, if it be the custom of the place, that the faithful hearing it may be moved to pray for the repose of his soul. The body of the deceased priest is laid out, dressed in his soutane, and with shoes on his feet. He is then vested in full vestments for Mass of violet colour or black (*S.C.R.* 4228), the biretta will be placed on his head and in his hands a small crucifix—not a chalice. Candles of unbleached wax, usually six in number, are placed round the bier.

The complete funeral rite comprises three things: the bringing of the body to the Church, the performance there of the exequial rites and the laying to rest in a place lawfully set aside for the burial of the faithful. The Exequial rites to be performed in the Church contain three functions: The Office of the dead (Matins and Lauds, or at least one Nocturn of Matins, with or without Lauds), the Requiem Mass and the Absolutions. We shall treat of each of these in order.

A. THE TRANSFERENCE OF THE BODY TO THE CHURCH.

Before the corpse is brought to the church the following preparations should be made in the sanctuary.

Six unbleached wax candles will be lighted. The candlesticks should not be of gold or silver; nor should they be encased in covers of black or violet (*S.R.C.* 3266). The tabernacle veil will be of violet colour (unless white is employed for all the colours). If the Blessed Sacrament is reserved then the antependium will be of violet—not black (*S.R.C.* 3201 ad 10). The altar steps and sanctuary are uncovered, but a carpet either of violet or black is laid on the predella (*Caer. Epis.* XI, 1).

The procession leaves the sacristy in the following order—Confraternities of the laity, cross bearer (in surplice) accompanied by two acolytes carrying two unbleached wax candles, cantors, clergy wearing birettas and then the Celebrant in surplice, black stole and cope. No thurifer is required. Should the Ordinary officiate in this ceremony, the Bishop will wear amice, pectoral cross, stole, cope, and plain white mitre. If he is the Metropolitan, the cross-bearer and acolyte will immediately precede the Prelate. The mitre and book bearers will follow. The holy water bearer will accompany the Celebrant unless the Bishop officiates, in which case he precedes the Cross bearer. Two assistants wearing surplices will accompany the Bishop and hold up the cope. The laity not belonging to a Confraternity will follow the Celebrant.

Having arrived at the place where the body of the deceased Priest is laid out the M.C. sees that the clergy receive lighted candles (not unbleached). Meanwhile the church bells are tolled. The cross bearer and acolytes stand at the head of the corpse, while the Celebrant and servers stand at the feet. The clergy arrange themselves on either side. The Celebrant and clergy remove their birettas (the mitre, if the Bishop officiates). The Celebrant receives the holy water sprinkler (without the usual oscula) and in silence the corpse is sprinkled to the front of the Celebrant, then to his left, and right. Having handed back the sprinkler, the Celebrant intones (*sine cantu*) the antiphon *Si iniquitates*, etc., and then recites the psalm *De profundis* with the clergy. At the end the antiphon *Si iniquitates* is said in full.

The Celebrant and clergy now put on their birettas and the procession leaves for the church in the same order in which it came from the sacristy. The coffin is borne after the Celebrant, and the laity follow. As soon as the procession begins the Celebrant (without biretta) intones

in a loud voice the Antiphon *Exsultabunt Domino*. The chanters then begin the Psalm *Miserere* and it is continued by the clergy. If the distance is long and the *Miserere* is finished, the Gradual Psalms or other Psalms from the Office of the Dead may be recited. On arrival at the Church the Antiphon *Exsultabunt Domino ossa humiliata* is repeated in full.

On entering the Church the Responsory *Subvenite* is begun, and sung while the procession advances through the church. Meanwhile the clergy (except the Celebrant) uncover on entering the church. The confraternities genuflect and go to their places in the church, while the clergy enter the sanctuary, genuflect, bow to each other and go to their places and stand. The Cross bearer and acolytes stand at the sanctuary side of the coffin and face down the church. The coffin is placed with the head of the deceased Priest towards the altar. The Celebrant stands at the foot of the coffin. Meanwhile six candles of unbleached wax are placed round the coffin. Having finished the *Subvenite* the Celebrant says, *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison, Pater noster*, etc., with the usual versicles, and then the prayer *Absolve, quaesumus* placing the word *Sacerdos* after the Christian Name, or the prayer *Deus, qui inter apostolicos sacerdotes*, etc. The prayer is concluded with the short ending. *Requiem aeternam*, etc., is added. The Celebrant then follows the Cross bearer and acolytes to the sacristy. It is presumed that the next portion of the funeral rite—the Office of the Dead, follows later—either the evening before the burial or before the Mass on the burial day.

(To be continued).

R. DONOHOE.

Homiletics

VII. CHRIST FOUNDED A CHURCH.

Jesus Christ claimed to be the Son of God come down to earth bringing the great Revelation of God to man. By the miracles He worked He produced abundant proof of the truth of His claims. But how was His Revelation to reach all men of all ages? He Himself taught for only three years, and only within the narrow confines of Palestine. How did He intend His message to come down the centuries and across the world to you and me?

Not by means of a Book. As far as we know, He never wrote anything, except once upon the sand. Nor did He order His followers to write. They did indeed write the Gospels, and letters as occasion demanded, but at no time did they attempt to write down a complete statement of His teaching. In fact, it is explicitly stated at the end of the last Gospel that many things He said and did were left unrecorded. In any case, a Book would not have been a satisfactory means of conveying the certain teaching of Christ. No matter how carefully compiled, how exactly worded, a book may still be interpreted differently by different men according to individual prejudices or caprice. One sees in the courts of law what widely different meanings opposing counsel may give to the same few words of the Constitution. If Christ's revelation had come down to us by means of the written word alone, no one could ever have been really sure that one rather than another interpretation of a disputed passage was the true one. To settle disagreements as to the meaning of the Constitution a High Court is provided. To eliminate doubt as to the true teaching of Christ there is equal necessity for a living voice, a present authority. Christ Himself or a representative authorised by Him must speak to me, or I shall never know for certain what He came to teach me.

That living voice, that present authority, that accredited representative of Christ is His Church. For He founded an organization, a visible society, which He commissioned to carry on His mission. That was not merely a mission to teach the truths of Revelation. He was more than a Prophet: He was also, He said, a King with power to command men, and a Priest, through Whose mediation men were to be reconciled with their Maker. That threefold function He willed to exercise by medium of His Church. To its first leaders He gave this great Commission: "All power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth.

As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. Go into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature: teach all nations, baptizing them....commanding them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you". In addition to this general commission, a particular position of authority was reserved by Christ for Peter: "Thou art Rock and on this rock I will build My Church, and I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven".

The Apostles certainly believed that Christ had given them, with Peter at their head, control over a visible organized society. We find them asserting that authority, laying down conditions for admittance to the Church, appointing its local authorities, regulating the ceremonial, imposing and enforcing discipline, defining true doctrine and condemning false teaching, administering the temporal property of local Christian communities. Moreover they believed that they had the power to transmit to others the authority they had received direct from Jesus. Practically their first official act was to elect a substitute to take the place of the traitor Judas. The early Christians, then, were not as some imagine, mere adherents of a movement having no more in common than a devotion to Jesus and an acceptance of His religious ideals. Christianity was in its very beginnings institutional, organized, disciplined, dogmatic, sacramental. The primitive Church was a visible organized society with its rite of initiation, its governing authority, its sacramental ceremonial, its defined doctrine. And as such it was the creation of Christ Himself. He called the first members together and commanded them to call others. He Himself invented the rite of initiation. His was the doctrine that was to be taught and believed; He laid down the commandments which were to be obeyed; He was the author of the sacramental ceremonial. From Him the government of the Church received its authority to teach, its right to demand obedience. In other words Jesus Christ founded a Church.

To that Church He promised two things: first, that it would last till the end of time; second, that it would always teach His Truth, no more, no less.

Obviously His Church needed to be thus endowed. If He came to teach all men of all ages, and if He willed that teaching to reach all men by means of His Church, that Church would need to be both imperishable and infallible. It would have to be protected against assault from outside and decay from within. Left to itself it would go the way of all human things; only divine support could guarantee its permanence in an ever changing world. But unless it were also safeguarded from going

wrong in its teaching, it would exist in vain. The human factor would inevitably corrupt and change, enlarge or simplify the original teaching. There had to be a divine assurance that it would always teach not the ideas of men, but the Word of God. Otherwise Christ might as well not have founded it at all, for all the use it would be to us two thousand years after.

Christ did, indeed, promise these two qualities to His Church.

He guaranteed its permanence till the end of time. After commissioning the Apostles to go out and teach the gospel to all nations, He added "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world". This invisible presence of Christ in His Church was to be its protection against the ceaseless attacks of evil forces. He predicted persecution...."they have persecuted Me, they will persecute you"....but the waves of diabolic fury would break in vain against the Church founded upon the Rock. "The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it".

Moreover, He promised that His imperishable Church would always teach only His doctrine. He identified Himself with their teaching when He said to His Apostles: "He that hears you, hears Me; he that despises you, despises Me". He ratified in advance their decisions when He said "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in Heaven". This infallible authority, this guaranteed fidelity to His doctrine was not to die in His Church with the death of its first leaders, the Apostles, for had He not said He would be with them "even to the consummation of the world"? And at another time He promised to send the Spirit of Truth Who would abide with them for ever.

Christ, then, committed His mission of teaching and saving mankind to a visible organization, His Church: and to that Church He guaranteed that it would always be in the world, and that it would never lose His authority. It follows that, if a man would know Christ's revelation, he must learn it from that Church; if a man would benefit from Christ's coming, he must seek that benefit through the ministry of Christ's Church. Membership of the Church is not optional. Christ's religion is, by His own clearly-expressed intention, institutional. It is nonsense to talk of being "a Christian without belonging to any Church"one might as well call oneself a soldier without enlisting in the Army. If we accept Christ as the representative of God we must submit to the Church as the representative of Christ. When He sent His Apostles to teach all nations, He laid upon all nations the obligation of listening to them. When He gave Peter the keys of the Kingdom of

Heaven, He obliged all who would enter into that Kingdom to seek entry through Peter. He said that men must eat His Flesh and drink His Blood if they would have life in them, but it was to the priesthood of His Church that He committed the power of providing that Food and Drink.

We cannot divorce Christ from His Church. If we want to follow Christ, we can do so only in the way He has laid down: as a member of His Church.

W. BAKER.



Notes

The Apostolic Constitution of the Sovereign Pontiff, dated 30th November, 1947, concerning the essence of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, decides peremptorily a celebrated question that has for centuries been a bone of contention among

APOSTOLIC
CONSTITUTION
ON HOLY ORDERS.

theologians. As a result of the Constitution many text-books on the question will have to be corrected, and what was once a favourite question of speculative theology now becomes

a matter of historical interest. A note such as this only allows us to mention the salient features of the Constitution and its principal repercussions on theological thought. We shall limit our remarks to the Order of Priesthood.

1. In the first place, the Constitution confirms the opinion held by the majority of modern theologians, though not a few have favoured a contrary doctrine, whereas, in the time of St. Thomas the "sententia communior" held that the essence of the Sacrament consisted in the tradition of the instruments and the words that accompanied the tradition.

The Constitution declares authoritatively that the matter of the Sacrament is found in the imposition of hands alone, and, indeed, in the *first* imposition of hands only, not in the second—which is more properly the extension of the right hand over the candidate and is in reality only a continuation of the first imposition—nor in the third imposition which is made at the end of Mass and is accompanied by the words: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou shalt forgive" etc. And, as the essential matter is one only, so also is the form, which is verified precisely in the words of the Preface: "Da quaesumus...conversacionis insinuet".

2. The imposition of hands has been undoubtedly used from the beginning of the Church in conferring the Sacrament. To it exclusively and directly the conferring of grace is ascribed by St. Paul and the Acts of the Apostles (*1 Tim.*, 4, 14; *2 Tim.*, 1, 6; *Acts* 6, 6; 14, 22). Moreover, the Fathers of the Church in all countries and in all periods unanimously proclaimed that no other rite was known amongst them for conferring the Sacrament than the "imprecatio vocis et manus impositio", and that this rite had come down to them from the Apostles themselves. The same doctrine is found clearly stated in all the early liturgical documents. The *Traditio Apostolica* of St. Hippolytus, writ-

ten about the year 200, which forms the most ancient ritual of ordinations, proves that the rite then in use consisted in the imposition of hands and a long and beautiful prayer accompanying it. An examination of all the other liturgical monuments, Greek, Armenian, Syriac and Coptic leads us unfailingly to the same conclusion. Moreover, the Greek Church, whose Orders have always been accepted as valid, to this day knows no other matter than the imposition of hands, and the Latin Church used it exclusively for nine centuries. It was not until the tenth century that the ceremony of the tradition of the instruments was added and gradually inserted itself as a prominent part of the ordination ceremony. It was this insertion that later gave rise to so much animated controversy.

In declaring, therefore, that the imposition of hands, and the words attendant upon it, are a *sufficient* matter and form for the validity of the Sacrament, the Constitution is stating no more than the doctrine held from the beginning of the Church. "Quod enim ubique et ab omnibus retentum est, auctoritate Apostolica traditum rectissime creditur".

3. But, in pronouncing that these two elements are henceforth to be considered as the *only* essential elements constituting the substance of the Sacrament, the Sovereign Pontiff's decree authoritatively renders obsolete certain opinions which until to-day have been freely held by many and great theologians.

a) The first of such opinions is that maintained by St. Thomas, many ancient scholastics and quite a few of our contemporaries (Galtier, Hugon, Lahitton)—according to which the Church, after the 10th century, abrogated the ancient matter and form, and in its place introduced the tradition of the instruments and the words accompanying it: "Accipe potestatem" . . . etc. Thus St. Thomas says: "In the giving of the chalice under the determinate form of the words the priestly character is impressed". (Suppl. Q 37, a 5). In this opinion, which St. Thomas gives us as the accepted opinion of his day, the imposition of hands and the words determining it are merely a preparatory ceremony.

b) A second opinion which can no longer be held is that of Scotus, St. Robert Bellarmine, the Salmanticenses, Billuart, and others, according to which the matter and form of the Order of Priesthood is two-fold, corresponding to the twofold power received: first, the tradition of the instruments, with the words: "Accipe potestatem . . ." in which is conferred the power over the physical Body of Christ; secondly, the *third* imposition of hands with the words: "Accipe Spiritum Sanc-

tum . . ." by which power over the Mystical Body of Christ is imparted. With all due respect to such great theologians, this opinion is in no sense solidly theological, even apart from all decrees, because, since the candidate has already celebrated the Holy Sacrifice, he must already have received the character of priesthood with all its powers; consequently, the third imposition of hands and the corresponding words can have no part in the essence of the Sacrament. To hold the contrary is to maintain that the priestly character is divisible, which is in no way theologically justifiable.

c) A third opinion excluded by the Constitution is the doctrine propounded by many theologians since the 18th century, and supported by many of our contemporaries : Billot, Tanquerey, Van Noort, De Guibert, Noldin. According to this school of thought a twofold matter and form is likewise demanded, namely, the first imposition of hands with its concomitant oration, and secondly, the giving of the instruments with the words : "Accipe potestatem . . .", which the Church added to the ancient rite as an equally essential part of the Sacrament, more clearly expressive of the power to offer sacrifice.

d) Finally, the disciples of Cardinal Lugo, Cardinal Gotti, Egger, and Amort now have to relinquish their all-embracing opinion postulating a threefold matter and form, namely, the first imposition, the tradition of instruments, and the third imposition, together with their respective forms.

From what we have already seen, it is quite clear that the new Constitution will cause quite a deal of consternation among the theologians of all schools as they humbly bow their heads in complete submission to supreme Authority.

4. Theologians do not propound doctrines without solid reasons. Therefore, when we see some of the greatest theologians the Church has ever possessed explicitly teaching a doctrine contrary to that which is authoritatively decreed in an Apostolic Constitution issued in our day, we must enquire into the reasons that determined their judgment. The question goes much more deeply than would appear at first sight. The real foundation of the four opinions we outlined above is the power of the Church with regard to the Sacrament. Christ, it is argued, instituted the Sacrament of Orders by instituting that in the Church there should be an external rite which would, of its own nature, signify and confer the priestly power and corresponding Grace. As Christ did not ordain His Apostles by imposition of hands, it would seem that He left to the Church the power of determining by which particular rite the

power and Grace should be conferred. The Church's determination of the particular rite to be used could thus be altered, by the Supreme Authority, according to the circumstances of time and place. Such a form of institution is known among theologians as "generic institution", and is opposed to "specific institution", according to which Christ not only indicated the power and Grace to be conferred, but Himself chose the precise matter and form by which the Grace would be signified and efficaciously bestowed, as for example, in the Eucharist and Baptism. Now, the above theologians maintained, as many do to-day, that Our Lord instituted the Sacrament of Orders only generically; consequently, the Church could and, *de facto*, did change the essential matter and form of the Sacrament. We are of the opinion that Christ specifically instituted the matter and form of Orders, but this is not the place to discuss the question.

The important thing to note is that the Constitution does not in any way decide this matter. It merely states—what all maintain—that if Christ did institute the Sacrament *specifically* the Church would have no power whatsoever over the "substance of the Sacraments". Consequently, the question, as regards this particular aspect, is still open, nor are the above theologians in any way censured.

5. Secondly, the opinions under discussion were based on the celebrated "Decree to the Armenians" of Pope Eugene IV, in the Council of Florence. The Decree, making no mention of the imposition of hands, states purely and simply: "The sixth Sacrament is that of Orders; and the matter of this Sacrament is that by the tradition of which the Order is conferred: thus, Priesthood is given by the tradition of the chalice containing wine and of the paten with bread.... And the form of the Order of Priesthood is this: "Accipe potestatem....". The Decree further notes that in the Orders of Diaconate and Episcopate the sufficient matter is the tradition of the instruments, and the form is contained in the words accompanying the tradition!

This celebrated Decree, it has been argued, bears the mark of conciliar and infallible authority. Many arguments, apparently of great strength, have recently been adduced to prove that statement. Moreover, it is argued, the Decree indicates the matter and form essentially sufficient or, at least, essentially necessary for the individual Sacraments. You all admit this to be true as regards the other six Sacraments; why then, demand these theologians, did the Decree remain silent on certain rites essential to the Sacrament of Orders? And, especially, how is it that the Decree erred in postulating as essential that which is,

according to you, merely accidental? You must admit, it is urged, that the Church abrogated the ancient rite, or, at least, that the Church intrinsically added to the ancient rite a new essential matter and form! Furthermore, does not the Roman Pontifical (in the Prologue to Orders) state explicitly: "Let the Bishop warn the ordinands to touch the instruments, by which *the character is impressed*"? And is not the character impressed then, and then only, when the Sacrament is perfected? Then you must admit that the Sacrament is essentially constituted by the tradition of the instruments and the accompanying form.

6. Now, the Sovereign Pontiff has not rejected the opinions of these theologians by expressly stating that the tradition of instruments with the concomitant form was never considered an essential part of the Sacrament. He merely reminds us that if ever, by the will of the Church, it was so, we must remember that by the same will of the Church such matter and form can be changed and abrogated. He then proceeds, conditionally, to abrogate it. Thus these opinions may not be held any longer, whatever may be said of the probability they enjoyed in the past.

7. However, the Constitution is a decisive blow to those theologians who have, till this day, considered that the Decree to the Armenians was an infallible document. By positively removing such teaching the Constitution greatly undermines the value of the argument hitherto drawn from the document. Must we say that Pope Eugene erred in this matter? Some, like Cardinal Van Rossum, would have us believe so. Or may we agree with Pope Benedict XIV when he asserts that his predecessor spoke only of "the integrating and accessory matter and form, which he wished the Armenians to add to the imposition of hands long since in use among them, that they might thus conform to the usage of the Latin Church, and more firmly adhere to it by unity of rites" (*De Syn. Dioc.* VIII, X, 8)? With all due respect to such an illustrious and learned theologian, we cannot accept such an interpretation. The very nature and wording of the Decree clearly show that Pope Eugene regarded the tradition of the instruments and its accompanying words as very much more than a mere integrating and accessory element of the sacramental rite. We are of the opinion that Pope Eugene had no wish to decide peremptorily the question of the essence of the Sacrament then under discussion among the scholastics, but he aimed to show the Armenians the doctrine concerning the Sacrament which at that time was the commonly held doctrine among the doctors. Since St. Thomas was the greatest of all who held the opinion that the

matter of the Sacrament was the tradition of the instruments, the Pope took his work and quoted it almost verbatim in the Decree to the Armenians. In doing so he was undoubtedly expressing his own private opinion, but he left the doctrine with the value that Aquinas had attributed to it when he said: "This is the third opinion, which is the more commonly held".

8. However that may be, Pius XII, in altering the Decree has removed all doubt as to its infallibility in regard to the section dealing with the Sacraments. In doing so, the Pope has confirmed the opinion of a host of theologians through the centuries and in our own day. That the section treating of the Sacraments is not infallible is sufficiently clear, for the following reasons:—

a) Pope Eugene clearly made a distinction between the different parts of which the Decree is composed, namely, "definitions", "traditions", "precepts, doctrines and statutes". It is evident to us, from the whole context, that the "definitions" cover the first parts of the Decree, namely, the Nicene Creed, Council of Chalcedon, and the third Council of Constantinople. Therefore, the instruction on the Sacraments must be numbered among the "doctrines", not among the "definitions". Moreover, the instruction on the Sacraments is taken almost verbatim from a work of St. Thomas, and it is hardly likely that the Pope wished to elevate a whole work of St. Thomas to the status of defined truth.

b) A definition ex-Cathedra should be announced as such to the entire Church because it binds all the faithful. But no Church except the Armenian was ever officially notified of this Decree. It seems, then, of itself, to lack the marks of an ex-Cathedra pronouncement.

c) Even after the promulgation of the Florentine Decree the Armenians refused to introduce the ceremony of the tradition of instruments. They were never reprimanded by the Holy See for having failed to do so, and, moreover, the Roman Pontiffs time and again have recognized the validity of the Oriental rite of the Sacrament which excludes the tradition of instruments.

d) Numerous theologians have openly rejected the doctrine in the Decree to the Armenians, sciente et tacente Ecclesia. Could one image the Church remaining passive if an army of theologians were to reject the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception?

e) Already in 1640 a commission appointed by the Sacred Congregation *De Propaganda Fide* openly declared its unanimous decision that the part of the Decree dealing with the Sacraments "does not contain a definition of Faith", but only a practical instruction.

There is no point in multiplying reasons; nor have we given the above with a view to justifying the reigning Pontiff's action, but merely as a matter of theological interest. Whatever may be said, few will deny that the celebrated Decree is an unhappy document.

THOMAS MULDOON.

* * * *

Canon 761 directs that a Christian name must be given in baptism. How do we judge whether a name is Christian? The following are some suggestions and queries, in the hope that others more versed in canon law than the writer, may correct and/or amplify.

CHRISTIAN NAMES. 1. Presumably any name occurring in the Roman Martyrology is a Christian name for the purposes of baptism and confirmation. Now some acquaintance with the index of this book may turn out useful, as the following incident shows:—

A mother who taught ballet dancing, wanted her daughter to be called "Salome" at Confirmation. During the ceremony when this name was presented, the Bishop demurred, feeling that it had unchristian associations. He turned to the assistant priest and asked, "Is that a Christian name?" The reassuring reply was: "It's in the Roman Martyrology, my Lord".

So the future danseuse was forthwith committed to the protection of Salome, the mother of two Apostles.

Again, the martyrology's index may lessen one's dislike for female names that sound "mannish," e.g., Pat shortened from Patritia; for apparently the Roman equivalent of Noble (Patritius) was popular, since we find it constantly occurring in the masculine and twice in the feminine. Hence there would be nothing out of place in choosing as the patroness of a baby girl either the virgin-martyr of Naples (Feast Day, Aug. 25) or the martyred wife of Macedonio (Mar. 13) each of whom was called Patritia.

Inevitably the name will later be shortened to Pat. But in order to prevent this, should we have the right to exclude Patritia as a baptismal name?

2. Heathen classical names occur in high places, for Achilles Ratti was Pope Pius XI. The baptismal name was quite in order, for there are no less than three martyrs who could have been his Holiness' patron.

Similarly if a classical-minded parent wanted his son baptised Plato; or if a wine-grower thought that Bacchus would admirably suit as a name for his son and heir, it would be difficult for the baptising priest to question the suitability of this choice. For the Roman Martyrology assures him these are names of Christian Saints and Martyrs. The same applies to Juvenal, Thyrsus, Socrates, Jason, Narcissus, Zeno. This latter name occurs no less than fourteen times, suggesting that Zeno's famous paradoxes like that of Achilles and the tortoise were popular with later Greeks.

3. (a) What is the ruling on linguistic adaptations, like Maureen for Mary, or Louis, Lewis, Lois or Aloysius for Ludovicus; Austin for Augustinus? Is the baptising priest obliged to register the name in its original classical form? Is there any means of indicating how the name is to be spelt officially by the child when grown up, or for showing which English equivalent has been selected?

(b) Are English translations of Latin or Greek Christian names allowed in the baptismal register? If we reply in the negative, then we are censuring a common practice, while we have the advantage of avoiding the intriguing problems which arise if translations of Latin and Greek names are allowed in baptism.

There seem grounds however for admitting these translations, since we find Faith, Hope, and Charity in parish registers. May we then go further and, for example, baptise as Pearl instead of Margerita, or Golden or Goldie instead of Aureus or Aureolus? Or could we perpetuate the mother's surname, e.g., Goodman, Gardiner, Black, or Flower, by giving these as Christian names, on the score that the Martyrology mentions Homobonus, Hortulanus, Melas (and Melanius), Flos? Doubtless later on the consequence would be a hyphenated name so much favoured in certain strata of society. Thus, when a Miss Goodman marries young Mr. Jones, her son would be Goodman-Jones under the heavenly protection of the martyr Homobonus.

4. What is the position of authoritative martyrologies other than the Roman? May names in them be used in baptism? In Japan the question is a practical one, for the Japanese treasure their language and dislike being westernised by missioners. Now in a large reliquary in a mission chapel, there are the authenticated relics of a number of martyrs who lived in the neighbourhood. The native Catholics proudly remember how their own people stand in the inner circle of Christ's heroes, the companions of saints like Lawrence, Lucy, Agatha, Pancratius, and Sebastian. They proudly know that the Japanese Catholic can be a

hero like those of the West. May then a missioner give these Japanese names in baptism in order to keep alive the memory of these martyrs and to observe the Japanese intelligible preference for their own native names?

If such a practice is admissible, one could in the parallel cases, use the authoritative lists of English, Scotch, French, German, Irish, Welsh and Oriental saints and martyrs. Are such lists available?

5. At present there seems a need for a catalogue of genuine Christian names, for we should be able to comply with the wishes of parents who are looking for pretty or uncommon ones for their children and who don't know of the many saints and martyrs with unusual and beautiful names. In the hope that someone may find time to add more, here to begin with, are a few for girls:—Ita, Verena, Aurea, Hilaria, Vestina, Christina, Zita, Daphrosa, Thecla, Una, Zoe, Zoa, Regina, Irene, Fortunata, Digna, Patritia, Oliva, Gyra, Anthia, Maura, Rosala, Rosa, Philippa—all from the Roman Martyrology.

H.L.B.

*

*

*

*

The new and revised edition of Dr. Enid Starkie's comprehensive study of Arthur Rimbaud has, no doubt, said all that can be said about the Rimbaud Case.¹ New documents alone will bring further information, and the hunt for lost, or mythical, writings at RIMBAUD, Aden and Harar has been pursued with eagerness, A CATHOLIC? but without success, up to the present moment.

There have been few more tragic figures in literature and in life than Arthur Rimbaud, whose angelic and childish face stares out of Fantin-Latour's painting, *Le Coin de Table*, now at the Louvre. Rimbaud was born on the frontiers of France and Belgium, at Charleville, in 1854. His unfortunate mother, unfortunate because she was called upon to mother and rear a genius, when a stolid and solid bourgeois would have been ideal for her, was a strict woman, with severe religious views. Her son had a brilliant career at school, but his extraordinary and rapid intellectual growth stunted his religious life. He was a violent and impious opponent of God, when he was but a

¹E. Starkie, *Arthur Rimbaud*, London, 1947, pp. 464 (1st edition in 1938); from a French view point, J.-M. Carré, *Vie de Rimbaud*, Paris, 1939, is of interest and value; Harold Nicolson, *Paul Verlaine*, London, n.d. [1920] deals admirably with the relations between the two poets. Dr. Starkie with feminine candour writes with excessive freedom on dangerous topics.

child of twelve or thirteen. The breakdown of all discipline in 1870-71 led to a crisis of wildness in Rimbaud. Wandering from home, the young writer met his fate, when he entered the home of the true poet, Paul Verlaine, who sits alongside the marvellous boy in Fantin-Latour's painting. Verlaine was wonderfully gifted, but weak, vicious and immoral. Their relationship in Paris, Brussels and London was ruinous. The shot fired by Verlaine at Brussels in 1873 marked the end of Rimbaud's literary life. Returning to his taciturn mother, he wrote that extraordinary *Une Saison en enfer*; he awaited its reception; the book met a wall of silence; he was only twenty. The literary circles of Paris had long dismissed him as a dirty, vicious lout. That he was, no doubt, but his age, and the fact that Verlaine was a man well established as an author, should mitigate a little the severity of the judgment, of whose harshness, Rimbaud, in truth, could not complain. The proud boy, who had dared to make himself the equal of God, who to find and express the inexpressible, had abused himself, until he was reduced to the state of a negro, as he calls it, was now with equal pride to draw back from literature with disgust and hatred. He had given up everything, lived in abject poverty and in horrible vice. He had done it with deliberation to remove the taint of Christianity from his blood. He lived a *Saison en enfer*, but evil and sin remained unconquered. Hence literature and poetry had failed him, never again would he write, as far as we know.² The unfortunate boy mutilated his genius; he was too proud to submit to God. His mysterious wanderings began—Germany, Italy, Java, even (as a Dutch soldier; he at once deserted), until he wore out his last years at Aden and Harar. He penetrated far into the then mysterious

²Oeuvres of Jean-Arthur Rimbaud, New York, n.d., Rimbaud left only some 200 pages. The essential part of his work is *Les Illuminations*, prose poems, and *Une Saison en enfer*, mainly prose. This last named book was the only one printed during his "literary life". It did not appear in the shops, as Rimbaud gave no directions, and the stock remained for years in a Belgian printing house, until it was by chance discovered. To these works must be added his remarkable poems, *Bateau Ivre*, *Les Cherceuses de Poux*, *Voyelles*, etc. The *Voyelles* seems to have been a *blague*. Rimbaud announced that he had discovered the colour of the vowels! They were, it is said, the colours given to them in a chart for primary school children. Yet music he got from them:

A noir, E Blanc, I Rouge, U Vert, O Bleu, voyelles,

Je dirai quelque jour vos naissances latentes....

and for the vowel, O:

O, suprême Clairon plein de strideurs étranges

Silences traversés des mondes et des Anges;

—O l'Oméga, rayon violet de Ses Yeux!

Abyssinia, as a trader and gun runner.³ In Paris, Verlaine was reeling from café to the confessional, and from the confessional to the café and absinthe. Rimbaud's fame was growing, as the Symbolists found in him and Baudelaire the sources of modern poetry. Little, Arthur Rimbaud cared, as he toiled under the African sun and lived the weary years. He was but thirty-seven, when he was brought home to die. The stubborn, heartbroken mother received him in silence, proud of his African gold, hating the wasted years, devoted to poems, which she never read.⁴ His sister prayed hard for the "*poète maudit*", the damned one. Long before Rimbaud had demanded God to give him *la liberté dans le salut*; never would he bend before any authority. Yet perhaps *si Dieu m'accordait le calme céleste, aérien, ta prière,—comme les anciens saints.—Les Saints, des forts! les anachorètes, des artistes comme il n'en faut plus!*—then all would be well. When he wrote that originally, Rimbaud, with perverse mockery, added: *Farce continue!* Now, as he lay in misery at the Hospital of the Immaculate Conception at Marseilles, he made the great surrender. He accepted the ministrations of a priest; he made his confession; he received the Sacraments. Peace came to that wild spirit. He blasphemed no more, but prayed continuously. He recaptured then the wondrous verbal beauty of his early years; he became again a *voyant*—a prophet; "he saw columns of amethyst, angels in marble and wood, countries of indescribable beauty; and he used, to paint these sensations, expressions of curious and penetrating charm"—so writes his sister, Isabelle, who to the sorrow of literature failed to take down the words of the dying poet. Years before he had written: *Et à l'aurore, armé d'une ardente patience, nous entrerons aux splendides villes.* God took him to Himself in the dawn of November 10, 1891. His sister brought the body back to the Ardennes. The stern mother on the very morning her son's body arrived at Charleville, approached the parish priest (who had been Rimbaud's professor of Religion at school!) and requested a funeral *de première classe* for ten o'clock that same morning. She would brook no

³Rimbaud had broken with the most notorious of his former weaknesses. He was no hypocrite. He does not appear, however, to have practised his religion. Father Jarousseau, who was a missionary at Harar, and, later, bishop, knew him in those days. "He often came to see me and we talked only of serious things", writes the bishop, "but he never spoke of himself". His manner of life was severe and quiet—reading and writing occupied his spare moments. But he was not living a Catholic, or a Christian life.

⁴When his mother read the *ms.* of *Saison en Enfer*, she was bewildered. She asked Rimbaud what it all meant. His answer did not help her, or us: "It means exactly what I've said, literally and completely, in all respects".

delay. So funeral pomp wended its way through the quiet streets of Charleville. The body was followed by two lonely mourners, the stern mother and his sister. She had him now, and if he had not been respectable in life, his mother was determined to make him so in death. They sleep together surrounded by the quintessence of *bourgeois* funereal decoration. Ten years later literary France erected the Rimbaud Monument at Charleville. His mother refused to attend the unveiling; and legend holds that, although she lived but sixty yards from the Monument, for the remaining years of her life she refused to traverse that square, where the sulky bust of her son glared at the town.⁵ How much of the mother was in the son, and of the son in the mother!

Now when all is over, when Rimbaud has been dead to poetry nearly seventy years, he remains one of the poets most studied. One can almost hear that diabolical laugh: *Farce continue!* He has been seen by his enemies as the *voyou* (lout), by his admirers as the *voyant*, almost as the saint! At least it is to his credit that his work converted to the faith that Catholic glory of France, Paul Claudel, who wrote with solemnity: "C'est Arthur Rimbaud qui m'a instruit et construit. Je lui dois tout. Il n'était pas de ce monde". For him, as for Daniel-Rops and others, Rimbaud's conversion and full surrender of his proud, inflexible will were the last chapter to the *Saison en Enfer* and *Les Illuminations*—the key to them. "For God hath concluded all in unbelief, that he may have mercy on all". Jadis, si je me souviens bien, ma vie était un festin... maintenant je suis maudit... je suis une bête, un nègre... Pitié! Seigneur j'ai peur... Marie! Sainte Vierge!... Horreur de ma bêtise... je ne comprends pas les lois, j' n'ai pas le sens moral, je suis un brute... Mais je puis être sauvé. So be it.

T. VEECH.

⁵The Germans in the invasion of France, 1940, destroyed the monument of the 'decadent' poet. He would have enjoyed that. It has since been restored.

Book Reviews

MONSIGNOR R. A. KNOX, *The Book of Psalms and the Canticles used in the Divine Office*, London, B.O. & W., 1947. 12/6.

On the 24th March, 1945, a new Latin translation of the Psalms and Breviary Canticles was published by the authority and at the behest of Pope Pius XII. When on the 19th January, 1941, His Holiness commissioned the Professors of the Biblical Institute, Rome, to undertake this new version, he made it clear that it was to be done from the original Hebrew as the basic text (cf. Bea, A., *La Nuova Traduzione Latina del Psalterio*, in *Biblica*, XXVI (1945), pp. 203-204). This new translation has been incorporated into most recent editions of the Breviary, and at the same time, translations have been made into several modern tongues (v.g., in English, *The Psalms in Latin and English*, by several authors, New York, Benziger Bros., 1946). The latest English translation of the work of the Biblical Institute is that of Monsignor Ronald A. Knox.

This reviewer's reaction to Mons. Knox's translation is twofold. The first is one of delight and satisfaction occasioned by the reading of the smooth, intelligible and beautiful English in which the translation is robed. In its English dress it is attractive and highly readable, and this fact explains, no doubt, the good reception given it by English lay people, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. Here, one feels, is a version of the Psalms that could be put into the hands of our Catholic people, with the certainty that they would be able to read, and understand, and relish, the most divine of all prayer books. For this reason, it is my opinion, that Mons. Knox's translation can do a world of good, and it will, I feel sure, kindle a real love for the Psalms among many Catholic lay folk in Countries where English is spoken.

But this initial enthusiasm is soon damped when one begins to compare the English translation with the new Latin version on the opposite page. For one remembers that the Holy Father stressed his desire that "no energy is to be spared in making it possible for the faithful to perceive ever more plainly the meaning of the Scriptures as intended by the Holy Spirit, Who inspired it *and as expressed by the Sacred Writer*" (*Motu Proprio, In Cœlo Precibus*, p. IX, of Latin translation). It was for this reason that the Vulgate was not revised, and the Hebrew selected as the basic text for the new translation. Mons. Knox seems to have forgotten this, and one's suspicions that the Vulgate text was

translated and then revised in the light of the Latin version, are confirmed by the translator himself in the May number of the 1948 Clergy Review. This we consider most unfortunate, especially in view of the fact that we are told, in the publisher's note, that the text is that of the new Latin translation.

Some examples chosen, for the most part, at random, will illustrate just how Mons. Knox's translation has departed from the letter and the spirit of the original Latin. He has a constant tendency to paraphrase, which, while being a very good thing in its place, is not a characteristic of the faithful translation. In Ps. 12, 3, we have "Quousque volvam dolores in anima mea", translated: "Each day brings a fresh load of care".

In Ps. 37, 2, "Domine, noli me arguere in ira tua nec me corripere in furore tuo", becomes: "Thy reproof, Lord, not thy vengeance; thy chastisement, not thy condemnation!".

And one could give scores of such examples.

Many of the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry, retained expressly by the Latin translation—and which one would expect to find in any faithful translation—have, it would seem, been just as expressly done away with in the English. In point of fact, we are told by Fr. Bea, S.J., (art. cit., p. 232) that the Hebrew anaphora in Ps. 12, 2-3, was deliberately reproduced in the Latin:

"Quosque, Domine? oblisceris mei omnino?

Quousque abscondes faciem tuam a me?

Quousque volvam dolores in anima mea, maerorem in corde meo cotidie?"

Quousque se extolleat inimicus super me?

which, in English, is: "Lord, must I still go all unremembered, must thy look still be turned away from me? Each days brings a fresh load of care, fresh misery to my heart; must I be ever the sport of my enemies?" The same is true of the other example, in this matter, referred to by Fr. Bea, viz., Ps. 92, 3-4 (although, who will make bold to deny the exquisite beauty of "Loud the rivers echo, Lord, loud the rivers echo, crashing down in flood"?).

Even the Latin endeavour to preserve the parallelism, so characteristic of Hebrew poetry, vanishes under the magic touch of the English master's pen:

Ps. 102, 13: "Quemadmodum miseretur pater filiorum,
miseretur Dominus timentium se"—

"For his own worshippers, the Lord has a father's pity".

The following examples will clearly show what little attention the English pays at times to the Latin original:

Ps. 6, 5: "Eripe animam meam": "Grant a wretched soul relief";

Ps. 16, 1: "...auribus percipe orationem meam ex labiis non dolosis": "Listen to this prayer of mine; they are no treacherous lips that make it";

Ps. 24, 22: "Libera, Deus, Israel": "When wilt thou deliver Israel";

Ps. 26, 6: "Et immolabo in tabernacula ejus hostias exultationis": "I will join with the throng, and make an offering of triumphant music in this tabernacle of his";

Ps. 87, 16: "Potavi terrores tuos et elangui": "wearily I have borne thy visitations";

Ps. 93, 8: "Quando sapietis?": "Learn your lesson before it is too late";

Ps. 101, 9: "Qui furunt contra me, imprecantur nomine meo".
" [my enemies] in their mad rage make a byword of me".

Monsignor Knox has given us a work that is very beautiful in itself, but does not seem to have captured the purpose or the spirit of the original, which endeavoured, and, for the most part, succeeded in giving a faithful translation of the Hebrew Psalms. On too many occasions, the English translation seems to have lost sight of the fact that the translator must strive to translate the text before him as faithfully as possible—not only in general, by giving the sense, but also by reproducing as far as possible, that nicety of phrase, the imagery, the metaphors, the rhythm, etc., of the original, so that the translation is, in truth, a real reflection of the original. For those who are able to read Latin Mons. Knox's translation is disappointing.

H.G.D.

*

*

*

*

DE DEO CREATORE, by Marcolinus Daffara, O.P., Marietti, Turin, 1947. 462 pp. 550 lire.

This is one of the volumes from Dr. Daffara's *Cursus Theologiae Dogmaticae*, the complete set now being available. The present volume is a masterly presentation of an extremely difficult tract, in which the author remains rigorously faithful throughout to the spirit and doctrine of the Angelic Doctor. The work happily combines immense erudition with a lucidity of thought and expression which is the fruit of many years spent in the professorial chair. The author never loses sight of

the student's mentality and possible difficulties, yet the consistently logical order and division of each question does not in any way impair the richness of the doctrine so safely and accurately expounded in accordance with Sacred Scripture, Tradition and the theological thought of the schools. The use of varied forms of type in accordance with the importance of the several questions under discussion, and the artistic taste displayed by the publishers enhance the value of the work as a text-book for seminaries.

It must be borne in mind, however, that this volume is one of a series and, consequently, the author very frequently refers the reader to pertinent passages in the other tracts without treating a particular question in all its detail. This would cause no great difficulty in seminaries where the complete series is adopted. The only adverse criticism we desire to make is that in some disputed questions, e.g., that of the concursus physicus, the author has not seen fit to mention the modern school of thought, eclecticism, which stands between rigid Thomism and Molinism, and which has a definite claim to the consideration of any progressive theologian.

T.M.

*

*

*

*

PLATFORM REPLIES, Vol. I, by Very Rev. John Canon Arendzen,
1947, The Mercier Press, Cork.

Canon Arendzen has here assembled a collection of replies prepared in answer to questions handed in to him directly and through the medium of Evidence Guild lectures over a period of six years. The questions have been preserved in their original form, even when a certain amount of "doctoring" would have made them easier to handle. Thus on occasion the author has to gird himself to deal with difficulties as amorphous as this: "With regard to the feebleness of my faith, is it enough for me to put my shirt on the Faith and to hope for the best? Or is there something more essential, and if so, how do I get it?" The answers, as one would expect, are much clearer, though usually less picturesque, than the questions.

The outstanding virtue of this work—and it is a virtue which poor paper and a cheap format ought not to disguise—is that it is obviously the fruit of prolonged personal reflection. Behind these simple, unpretentious answers one discerns the patient thought of a constructive theologian, such, indeed, as Canon Arendzen is known to be. There is nothing here like the ready-made answer or the stock explanation to

which, less well-equipped apologists must perforce often recur. On the contrary, each solution is thought out afresh and made to emerge, as by an organic process, from the principles on which it depends; and where the matter treated is positive and factual rather than speculative or doctrinal, there is evidence that the author has consulted original sources as far as possible. The amateur apologist could hardly set himself a more salutary exercise than by first reading the questions in this book, with his hand over the replies and then trying to plan his own counter-attack. When he consults Canon Arendzen he will often feel like starting all over again. One advantage of the author's insistence on valid reasoning rather than conventional expression is that he is sometimes able to take a most unpromising-looking formula from his interlocutor and to give it a perfectly good sense. Most of us, posed with the question: "May not man in his great urge towards the ideal have created religion for himself?", would instinctively feel that this was the occasion for a lock-stock-and-barrel refutation. But Canon Arendzen replies imperturbably: "Most certainly, man in his great urge towards the Ideal has created religion for himself". And then, having slipped in urbanely through his opponent's door, he emerges calmly through his own a paragraph later. Sometimes, however, he causes a different sort of surprise, as when (presumably as a result of personal investigation) he refuses to admit, as other Catholics do, the purely factual basis of a difficulty like the existence of a Trinity in the Indian Vedic theology.

The questions submitted are, on the whole, pleasantly fresh and range over a wide field. Most of them are popular in tone, but they are often thorough-going, and one or two are acute. One feels that they have all been courteously and fairly met—even when they involve such refractory subjects as the problem of evil. Not everyone, however, will agree with individual answers here and there. The strict dichotomy of spiritualism, for instance, into "fraudulent" or "diabolical", which Canon Arendzen employs, is no longer regarded as complete by those who have been impressed by Fr. Thurston's studies. Again, some readers might wish for a greater clarity of expression in the section dealing with Indulgences and Purgatorial "time". In general, however, Canon Arendzen's work is extremely lucid. Those who look for the brilliance of Mgr. Knox or the raciness of Fr. J. C. Heenan will not find such things in these plain, even pedestrian pages; but for that reason the work will be more useful to the ordinary Catholic apologist who is looking, not for a style which he could never reproduce, but for thoughts

which he can put into his own words. Such thoughts Canon Arendzen's book will give him in good measure, pressed down and overflowing.

S.J.

*

*

*

*

THE CRUSADE OF FATIMA: *The Lady More Brilliant Than The Sun*, by John De Marchi, I.M.C., arranged from the Portuguese by Asdrubal Castello Branco and Phillip C. M. Kelly, C.S.C. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1948. 177 pp. \$1.25.

Our enthusiasm over this remarkable book is unbounded. We have no hesitation in saying that it is by far the most satisfactory work that has yet appeared in English on the all-important subject of the apparitions of the Mother of God at Fatima. It is so because the book is an arrangement of Father John De Marchi's long and authoritative account of the wonders of Fatima under the title *A Lady More Brilliant Than The Sun*. Even the most exacting critics of former accounts of the apparitions willingly concede that Fr. De Marchi's work eclipses all literature that has appeared in so many languages on this vital subject. The author spent more than three years at the shrine of the apparitions, and the fruit of his labours, meticulous investigations and intimate interviews with the principal witnesses of the marvellous events of 1917 is a work of the greatest critical value which is, at the same time, a sheer delight to all who read. It bears, moreover, the unique distinction of enjoying the unqualified endorsement of Sister Lucia de Jesus, the principal recipient and guardian of the secret revelations.

The work under review is not a complete translation but an arrangement of De Marchi's book. It is destined for a wider public than could have been embraced by a full, costly translation. Yet, while it necessarily gives us some passages of the original in a condensed form it is still faithful to the original in all its authoritative strength, persuasion and irresistible appeal. It is unfortunately true that our Australian people, comparatively unscarred by the ravages of the war, have not as yet fully grasped the tremendous import and significance of the apparitions at Fatima. The vast majority of objections prematurely raised against their veracity has no theological foundation whatever, but rather, we have found that such objections spring from unbecoming prejudice, which is the worst of all natural diseases, and are generally voiced by those who have not taken the trouble to study closely the factual account of the Fatima revelations.

It is true that certain apparent inconsistencies have appeared in

former works, particularly regarding the precise words used by the Blessed Virgin during the apparitions. To our mind, the greatest merit of "The Crusade of Fatima" lies in the fact that it dispels these difficulties by giving us Lucia's own precise wording in answer to these very difficulties. We wholeheartedly recommend this book to all, from the first to the last. No matter what your station in life may be there is a personal message of the utmost importance in it for you. The sooner we realize this the better it will be for Australia and the whole world. Fatima, with all its marvellous revelations, is the God-given guarantee of peace and salvation. But its force will not be fully realized until every individual, every home, every diocese, and every country sincerely consecrates itself in prayer, penance, and reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Let us bestir ourselves. *Juravit Dominus!* He will repent only if we resist. To resist is to perish: in sorrow the world realized that in the last war, which Mary predicted. She tells us now that Her Son's arm is raised in anger to strike the blow. How long can She restrain it? That depends on us. Our only hope is in the crusade launched by Mary on the barren heights of Fatima.

T.M.

*

*

*

*

THE ABBE EDGEWORTH, by M. V. Woodgate. Dublin, Browne and Nolan Ltd., n.d. (1947), pp. 235. 7/6.

Miss Woodgate is well known to all who are interested in France and French history by a series of books. Here she deals with the Abbé Edgeworth. The full light of history rested on him for a moment; he was the priest who assisted Louis XVI on the scaffold. The name is not French and the Abbé Edgeworth indeed was an Irishman, born at Edgeworthstown in Co. Longford in 1745. His father was the Protestant rector of the town, the family being of English origin. While the future abbé was a small boy, his father astounded his friends by becoming a Catholic and taking his family to France, to Toulouse. His son became completely French, studied at the Sorbonne and was ordained priest. He devoted himself to the poor, even going to the extent of changing his name, as the best the French could make of his name was "Edgevatz". Miss Woodgate gives an impressive picture of slum life in Paris, which is well done. Dr. Moylan, Bishop of Kerry, who had met Edgeworth, asked him on many occasions to come back to Ireland, but the abbé thought it too late to start a new life. The Revolution came, and with it dark days. So hard was it to find a priest to act as con-

fessor to the Royal family that on St. Patrick's Day, 1791, Henry Essex Edgeworth, the abbé de Firmont as he was known in Paris, was summoned to the palace. King Louis XVI, when he knew his fate was sealed, sent a message to the priest, who most bravely wrote that he would be the King's friend in life and in death. For seventeen hours he was with the King before his death. Louis, who had the best appetite in France, so it was said, showed himself in another light during those hours. With Christian resignation, with patience, with forgiveness, the French King revealed himself a son of St. Louis, and of Louis XIV, too. Mass was celebrated, the King receiving the Blessed Sacrament. Then came the dread drive in the tumbril. With Louis was the devoted priest, who was drenched with the royal blood during the execution. And then, as every schoolboy knows, Edgeworth shouted: *Fils de Saint Louis, montez au ciel!* Miss Woodgate rejects this story, however, and it is one that Abbé Edgeworth never spoke of. So another nice phrase has to be banned. From that time he was adopted by the French Royal family, following the future Louis XVIII in his wanderings during the years of Napoleon. He died in 1807, at Mitau, near Riga, where the bulky Louis XVIII conducted himself as if he were at Versailles, royal mass, two tables, etc. The last years had been hard for the abbé. He rests still there "with so many" iron winters "to sweep snow over the stone that covers him". The remarkable Louis XVIII wrote for him in Latin what must be one of the longest and most pompous of all epitaphs. This book will find a little place in any Revolutionary library. It is of interest, too, that Maria Edgeworth, the novelist, was a relative of the noble Abbé.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

FATHER DOMINIC BARBERI, by Denis Gwynn. London, Burns and Oates, 1947.

This book is certain to prove a popular biography. It comes at an appropriate time since next year will be the centenary of the death of Father Dominic, who played no small part in the Catholic revival in England during the last century. In the minds of many, Father Dominic is a shadowy figure who received Cardinal Newman into the Church. The man himself, his holiness, missionary zeal and work, are little known. The two splendid biographies by Fr. Urban Young, "Life and Letters of Fr. Dominic Barberi", and "The Venerable Dominic Barberi" have for many years been unobtainable. In writing a new

biography, Denis Gwynn has rendered a service, not only to admirers of the great Passionist priest, but also to all interested in the lives of God's zealous champions. Mr. Gwynn, well-known as a writer with an intimate knowledge of the stirring days of the Catholic revival in England, gives in this book a fascinating portrait of a lovable and unusual character.

"If they want to convert England", wrote Newman some years before his conversion, and at a time when convert friends were annoying him with invitations to enter the Church, "let them go barefooted into the manufacturing towns—let them preach to the people like St. Francis Xavier—let them be pelted and trampled on, and I will own that they (Catholics) can do what we (the C. of E.) cannot". Father Dominic did not read those words, but for years he had been preparing himself to labour for God in England exactly after the fashion described by Newman. Little did Newman think when he wrote this prophetic outburst, that it would be to one of these barefooted apostles he would make his first confession and profession of faith.

St. Patrick heard "voices" calling him to Ireland. Dominic from his early years also heard "voices" calling him to England, even though he knew nothing of England and had never met an Englishman. Nor for the greater period of his life did it ever seem probable that he would go. He was born in a village near Viterbo in 1792, the youngest of a peasant family of eight children. A severe illness, just when he was on the verge of marriage, was the occasion of his decision to enter the Passionist Order. Lacking education and being twenty-two years of age he could only enter as a Laybrother. Even in that capacity he showed such ability and holiness that his Superiors decided to relax the ordinary rule of the Order and had him begin his studies for the Priesthood. He proved himself an exemplary and brilliant student. After ordination his advancement in the Order, both as Professor and Administrator, was rapid. But all the time his thoughts and fervent prayers were directed towards England. His heart's desire became intensified when he came in contact in Rome with Sir Henry Trelawney, Mgr. Wiseman and particularly those two ardent converts, the Hon. George Spencer and Ambrose Phillips.

It was not until he was forty-eight years of age that the ambition of his life was granted. He had only ten years to live, ten years of incredible activity as preacher, teacher, Parish Priest, retreat-giver, writer, administrator. He was all things to all men. His holiness and winning personality won the veneration and esteem of aristocrats and the poor.

His influence on Newman was no more than an incident, and an accidental one at that, in the whirl of activities which reached their climax with the labours, which hastened his death, for the Irish immigrants who poured into England after the famine.

There is much in this excellent book which one is tempted to quote. May we include one, a pen-picture of Father Dominic as he appeared to the people in his constant travels: "He was not handsome, nor was he tall. He was short, and rather stout of body, and his voice was squeaky, but he had an eagle eye. His coat was not made in any style known to English tailors; it was neither clerical nor secular; it fitted nowhere; and where it might fit it was wrongly buttoned. He carried a watch which might well have served for a town clock among Liliputians...his pantaloons were evidently constructed without any consideration for the length and circumstance of the legs they enclosed. His gait was shuffling. The comical twinkle of his eye when he told a good story, and his grave demeanour when he spoke of heaven, made him seem a compound of all that was humble and sublime in human nature."

Altogether a splendid book for priest and layman. Religious Communities will welcome it for refectory reading.

J.G.

*

*

*

*

PRIEST-WORKMAN IN GERMANY, by Henri Perrin, translated by Rosemary Sheed; London, Sheed and Ward, 1947.

This is a remarkable book. Although from the title one might be led to expect a tale of horrors—Gestapo, concentration camps, and the rest, in reality the war in its more brutal aspects finds only a minor place in the story. The book takes the form of extracts from a diary, which are completed by a number of short chapters on various persons and episodes. The author, a young Jesuit, volunteered to go to Germany as a turner in order that he might see to the spiritual needs of the Frenchmen who were being conscripted for labour in German factories. His diary is concerned principally with his work for souls amid the restrictions imposed by the authorities, and the indifference of those for whom he sacrificed so much. Inevitably his work attracted the unfavourable notice of the Gestapo, and he was imprisoned. The story of his life in prison contains several instances of acts of charity comparable in their heroism to those familiar in the lives of many saints.

Fr. Perrin's book is worth reading merely for the insight it gives into the condition of Germany during the latter years of the war. The

effects of mass bombing, the relations between the people and the regime, and the state of the moral and intellectual life of the country are analysed by an intelligent and conscientious observer, who records his conclusions in a lucid and pleasant style. Moreover, while in prison the author lived for a number of months with a group of Russians. Many who are inclined to oversimplify the Russian problem would do well to take into account what he learned and the conclusions he draws.

Père Perrin's story is also worth reading merely as a story. But why it *ought* to be read is for the spirit that breathes life through its pages. The book is written with such simplicity and directness that one feels that one has come into intimate contact with its author. That element of self-consciousness which is the besetting sin of autobiographical writing is completely absent. No barrier is placed between writer and reader either by egotism or by false humility. It is always evident that the author's only desire is to share with his readers the experiences, and, above all the spiritual experience, that by the grace of God have been his.

Such books are rare, and none ought to be indifferent to them. But the book will undoubtedly be of particular appeal to priests. They will find in its pages a dignified, yet concrete and living expression of all that is best in modern French priestly piety, thought, and action: a radical conviction that Christ lives in ourselves and our neighbours: a spontaneous spirit of communion with the whole Church and with the Person of Christ in the liturgy; and a zeal that is delicacy itself.

Finally, many a reader may judge this review too enthusiastic to be objective. To such a one my answer is a challenge: let him read the book, and see if he is not compelled to agree with what I have said.

J.B.

*

*

*

*

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN WRITERS: THE WORKS OF THE FATHERS IN TRANSLATION, *ed.* J. Quasten, S.T.D., and J. Plumpe, Ph.D.:

No. 1—THE EPISTLES OF ST. CLEMENT OF ROME AND ST. IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH, *Newly Translated and Annotated* by James A. Kleist, S.J., Ph.D.; The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland. pp. 165. \$2.50.

"But my archives are Jesus Christ!" The exclamation of St. Ignatius of Antioch rings clear to us across the centuries. It seems to shatter at one blow the pretensions of the heavy tomes of Migne, and

shrink them into bookish dust. Set against the person of Jesus Christ as revealed to us in the limpid words of the Gospel, what are the verbose tractates of the Fathers? But in reality no better justification could be found for the importance Catholic tradition has attached to the reading of the Fathers than those few words of Ignatius. For the works of the great Fathers are the authentic Gospels of the life of Christ in His Mystical Body. Our love for "the Whole Christ" ought to be the measure of our enthusiasm for the Fathers of the Church.

Hence it is with great pleasure that we welcome the first appearance in one of the two new series of patristic translations recently undertaken by American Catholics. With the aid of scholars from all English-speaking countries the editors of the *Ancient Christian Writers* series hope to bring out a large selection not only of Greek and Latin, but also of Armenian, Arabic and Coptic works.

Fittingly enough, the collection has been inaugurated by a volume containing the letters of Sts. Clement of Rome and Ignatius of Antioch. Both by its material presentation and its contents this volume gives golden promise that the series will prove worthy of its object. The editors are concerned with making available to the general reader "a new translation that is at once faithful to the original message and intelligible to the reader of this century". Thus Fr. Kleist, believing that "the reader who wishes to enjoy the additional luxury of tasting the full Ignatian flavour must of necessity go to the original" (pp. 57-8), has emulated the brilliant succinctness of the Ignatian style only where he has considered it possible to do so without loss of clarity and simplicity. For instance, the phrase rendered above as: "But my archives are Jesus Christ", is translated by him as: "But to me the official record is Jesus Christ". The difference in tone between the two versions is immense. Nevertheless, taking the translation as a whole the sacrifice made in favour of clarity is not as great as might be expected. The clearer rendering makes for a more rapid flow in reading the letters, and enables the reader to capture the rapid transitions of thought and emotion more effectively than would a less facile translation, no matter how picturesque it might be.

The letter of St. Clement, with its smooth, and often graceful style, has been translated somewhat more literally than the Ignatian letters. At times a more elegant rendering would seem desirable, in order to keep the tone of the work consistent. However, we have no desire to quibble with Fr. Kleist, who has long ranked as one of America's foremost classical scholars. Unfortunately we have not had the opportunity

of comparing his translations with those of J. H. Strawley. Some will regret that he has left aside the Biblical flavour of Lightfoot's work; others that he has not achieved the smoothness of Kirssopp Lake's. But Fr. Kleist's version is in many respects closer to the original and more nuancée than either of its predecessors, a result which is achieved by a liberal use of paraphrase as opposed to literal translation.

The forty-three pages of notes contain all the references, and explain allusions and difficulties in the text as concisely as possible. Contentious questions are indicated, but generally not discussed, and copious references, particularly to German writers, are added. Likewise in the introductions the historical background, general character, teaching and significance of the letters are briefly treated, questions of authenticity being left aside. Finally a complete index is provided.

The preceding pages had already been written, when we received the third volume of the series for review.¹ Its format and general characteristics are the same as those of the first volume. Unfortunately, however, the translation is not of the same literary quality. Careful comparison with the original shows that the translator has been scrupulously exact. Never does he take any liberties in interpretation, even in the difficult passages on free will and original sin. But his scrupulosity has made the translation turgid and dull, and at times has even betrayed him into such barbarisms as "visits the sick and the *shut-ins*" (P. 72). Nevertheless, for those who, in these dark days, so like those of Augustine's own last years, wish to nourish their minds and hearts on the strong meat of the Prince of Catholic Doctors, this volume supplies an intelligible and accurate translation of a work which is a comprehensive compendium of his maturest thought. The translation of St. Augustine's *First Catechetical Instruction*, which forms the second volume of this series, has not yet reached us.

The fourth volume contains *The Contemplative Life* of Julianus Pomerius.² The title is somewhat misleading, for in reality only the first of the three books into which the treatise is divided deals with the contemplative life, and even there it is considered from the point of view of one engaged in active work. The second book deals with the care of souls, and the third with the cultivation of true virtue. In all three books the priest of to-day will find judicious counsels synthetised in a balanced Augustinian theology. The translation reads easily, and any-

¹*Ancient Christian Writers*, No. 3: *St. Augustine, Faith, Hope, and Charity* (Enchiridion), trns. by Louis A. Arand, S.S., S.T.D., pp. 165. \$2.50.

²Trns. by Sr. M. J. Suelzer, Ph.D. pp. 220. \$2.50.

one who will apply a small amount of patience when the author waxes a little prolix, may easily get to know and love this admirable little work.

These volumes are elegantly printed and handsomely bound. Subscribers to the whole series, which is expected to number more than a hundred volumes, receive a discount of ten per cent. If Catholics everywhere, clerical, religious, and lay, do not seize this opportunity of gaining an appreciation of their Catholic heritage, it will not be the publishers alone who will be the poorer.

J.B.

* * * *

WAYS OF CONFUCIUS AND OF CHRIST, by Pierre-Célestin

Lou Tseng-Tsiang, O.S.B., London, 1948. Burns Oats. 140 pp.
10/6.

This is a delightful little book, and a real joy to read. There was much talk in the Belgium of the 1930's about a Chinese diplomat, who had become a Benedictine at the Abbey of Saint-André, near Bruges. Here we have a short, too short by far, account of his curious *curriculum vitae*. The book is dedicated to "the blessed memory of those to whom after God, I owe most happiness on this earth: to my respected parents, M. Lou, *née* Ou Kin-Ling; to the glorious memory of my Master, the Minister Shu King-Shen; and to the much-loved memory of my wife, Berthe Lou Tseng-Tsiang, *née* Bovy. In their persons, and in all things, may God be glorified". Dom Lou then explains this enchanting dedication in his book, which is a translation from the French, but remains whether in English or French, very Chinese. Dom Lou was born at Shanghai in 1871, of well-to-do and distinguished parents. His mother's death, while he was still a child, remains a source of grief to him. With beautiful and Chinese delicacy he salutes those who have the joy of retaining a mother's love and guidance for long years. The family was Protestant, belonging to the London Missionary Society. Dom Lou remembers everything and loves all. Hence he mentions with honour, Dr. Muirhead, who baptised him in 1873. He chose diplomacy for a career; in 1892 he was sent to the Chinese Imperial Legation at St. Petersburg, as an interpreter. Due to the interest of the Minister, Shu King-Shen, Dom Lou entered the diplomatic ranks, and, so the author holds, the way was being prepared for the future monk and priest. Dom Lou describes well two worlds that have passed away, imperial China and imperial Russia. The remarkable Minister told him the strength of Europe was in religion. His advice was to study the

Christian religion. While in Russia, Dom Lou met Berthe Bovy, a relation of the Belgium minister at the Russian court. They were married in 1899, according to the Catholic rite at St. Petersburg. They were completely happy, except that God did not bless them with children. In 1900, the Minister Shu was beheaded at Pekin, blamed for the Boxer Rising. This event upset Dom Lou's relations with the imperial authorities, and he became a sincere supporter of the forward party in China. At this period he cut off his pig-tail, much to the dismay of his friends. Dom Lou held posts at the Hague, again at St. Petersburg, where, in 1912, he became a Catholic, due to the influence of his wife. He finally became Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of China at Versailles for the Peace Treaty, 1919. In 1926, God, in His Providence, removed from this life, the good angel of Dom Lou, Madame Lou. Her body was laid to rest at Laeken, close to the graves of the Belgian Royal Family, for whom Dom Lou has a constant and warm affection. Led by Confucius, as Dom Lou firmly holds, as the natural leads to the supernatural, and by the example of his Belgian wife, he studied the Catholic Church and its faith. In 1927, the last step was taken when he became a Benedictine, with the sweet sounds of the bells of Bruges ringing in his ears. There the wonderful old man, minus his flowing and gaudy robes, his beard and with no signs of pig-tail about his close cropped Benedictine head, praised God and was beloved of all. In 1946, Pope Pius XII deigned to confer the abbatial dignity upon him, of the title of Saint-Pierre of Ghent. Cardinal Tien invited the dear abbot to take his old Belgian title and found a Ghent in China. It would indeed be a fitting conclusion to his remarkable life.

T.V.

*

*

*

*

"ETHICAL GUIDE FOR NURSES", by Dr. L. Rumble, M.S.C.,
Annals Office, Kensington.

Copies of a booklet by Dr. Rumble called "Quizzes on Hospital Ethics for Nurses, Doctors, Priests and Sisters", arrived in Sydney from America last year. Many people, who could not procure a copy, expressed the wish that the booklet be published in Australia. This has now been done by the Annals Office, Sacred Heart Monastery, Kensington. The title has been changed to "Ethical Guide for Nurses". Though not as attractively produced as the American original, it is well produced.

The booklet contains 165 questions and answers which cover most of the problems of Nurses and Doctors in their professional work. The

first part deals with the nature of the Nursing Profession, the second with its deontological problems—co-operation, contraception, birth control, Spiritual aid, with prayers for the dying, form a useful appendix at the end.

We recommend the booklet, not only to medical people, but also to Priests who will find it most useful for guidance in the confessional.

Dr. Rumble deserves our thanks for another useful booklet, at a price (1/6) which makes it accessible to all.

J.G.

*

*

*

*

CHRISTIANITY AND NATIONAL PATRIOTISM, by Rev. James G. Murtagh, M.A., 1948: Catholic Social Guild, Melb. pp. 33; 1/-.

Events of recent years show that there is still a disinclination to profit by the lessons of history—even of recent history. The last two World Wars were precipitated by snarling nationalisms and ill-founded patriotisms; there are now, at best, only half-heartedly submitting their aspirations to the law of reason—and in no measure to the law of God. Therein lies the main obstacle to the success of the United Nations Organization.

But, in any case, it is one thing to endeavour to settle problems, post factum, by means of international machinery; it is quite another matter to forestall them on the national level: at their root: misguided national fervour.

For this reason any published “attempt to outline the Christian doctrine of National Patriotism” is sure to be an item of more than interest to those who feel genuinely for a just and lasting settlement of existing social distress—and should be so to others. It is precisely such an outline which the Rev. James Murtagh has sketched—and sketched well,—in the little work here reviewed.

Part I of this short yet well-rounded booklet is devoted to an analysis of National Patriotism—the underlying idea of man, his relation to the fatherland, theories of the Nation, formation of Society, the State, race, and the element patriotism. The work here is well arranged and the thought clearly expressed; this Part concludes with a statement of the Christian concept of National Patriotism: “patriotism is one of the most fundamental of the Christian virtues”; it is a manifestation of pietas, and so it carries obligations in the service of national unity and the common good.

Against this background Father Murtagh accounts in Part II for

the "false, blind and exclusive nationalism" which is "the distinguishing mark and major problem of our time"; it is seen as a reversion to primitive tribalism.

In the discussion of the rise of Australian nationalism—here, of course, the author of *Australia: The Catholic Chapter* is very much at home,—the timeliness of the present work is brought out. He sees in the teaching—right from the school level—of patriotism as a Christian virtue, the much-needed corrective of the present-day fact that "Australian nationalism has become largely a mass of negatives". Who could disagree?

This Part concludes with a brief but adequate appraisal of the Communist, Humanitarian and Christian solutions to the problems of extreme nationalism, and with an appeal for that education which will again restore the essential link between patriotism and religion.

Throughout this Part the arrangement is again apt and the style characteristically simple.

At a time when another war is imminent and true patriotism is fast fading from men's systems of virtues, Father Murtagh has given us an opportune monograph which shows a line of Christian thought to advantage. It is a worthy successor of the author's earlier contributions in the spirit of the Catholic Social Movement and could do much to induce right thinking and action in a matter which is to-day not only important, but necessary.

N.T.

* * * *

DE ADUMBRATIONE S.S. TRINITATIS IN VETERE TESTAMENTO SECUNDUM SANCTUM AUGUSTINUM,
Mundelein, by F. L. Smid.

The author of this little work has welded together in pellucid latin the thoughts of the great doctor of Hippo, not only from his ex professo exegesis, but also from pertinent passages in apologetics and other works. St. Augustine thus appears before us illumining the Old Testament with light from the New and so drawing out a wealth of Trinitarian theology that would otherwise remain hidden. The fact that Pius XI acknowledged the reliability of this Saint as a guide in approaching "mysterium hoc omnium intellectu difficillimum" (Encyc. Ad Sal. Aum. Generis 1930) should recommend the work to many.

J.O'B.

"DE SACRIFICIO COELESTI SECUNDUM SANCTUM AMBROSIUM", by Eduardus Fitzgerald, pp. 86. Mundelein, Illinois, 1941.

Amid the varied flights of modern theological controversy, it is essential that we continually keep in contact with the sure base of Divine Revelation. This thesis treats of such a modern controversy, the "Sacrificium Coeleste", of which St. Paul speaks, in the light of texts taken from St. Ambrose's works. The topic is interesting, the treatment is well done; but as St. Ambrose has little to say on the subject, and as even that little is vague, this work will have a restricted appeal.

I.E.C.

* * * *

"DE FUNDAMENTIS ACTIONIS CATHOLICAE AD MENTEM SANCTI GREGORII MAGNI", by J. Voss, Seminarium Sanctae Mariae ad Lacum, Illinois.

Although Catholic Action is not an "innovatio nostrorum temporum", it has not always appeared under the same form, but of its very nature has had to accommodate itself to the peculiar needs of each age. In this interesting dissertation the author gives an account of Catholic Action as it can be known from the pen of St. Gregory the Great. He treats the matter under three headings: The Priesthood of Christ, His Prophetic Office, and His Regal Office, and applies each of these first to the Hierarchy of the Church and then to the laity. Finally he concludes that according to St. Gregory the laity, in participating in the threefold office of the Hierarchy, in some way fulfil the Episcopal Apostolate. This conforms in every way with the definition of Catholic Action given by Pope Pius XI to the Catholic Associations of Rome: "The participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church".

J.M.E.

* * * *

DOCTRINA SANCTI LEONIS MAGNI DE CHRISTO RESTITUTORE ET SACERDOTE, by Damasus Mozeris. pp. 85. Mundelein, Illinois, 1940.

This thesis, the eleventh in the series published by the Seminary of St. Mary of the Lake, adds to J. Rivière's classical treatment of the question a wealth of citations, and states the pope's doctrine in its broader dogmatic setting.

J.B.

SERMON MASTERPIECES

by

THE MOST REV. TIHAMER TOTH, D.D.

(Professor, University of Budapest)

Translated by

N. G. AGOTAI,

and edited by Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D.

BELIEF IN GOD	12/3, Post 5d.
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	21/-. Post 6d.
THE GREAT GOD	14/-. Post 5d.
THE GREAT REDEEMER	19/3. Post 7d.
THE GREAT TEACHER	15/9. Post 5d.
THE EVERLASTING	14/-. Post 5d.
THE OUR FATHER	19/3. Post 6d.
THE RISEN CHRIST	14/-. Post 5d.

Pellegrini & Co. Pty., Ltd.

543 George St., Sydney; 240 Elizabeth St., Melbourne; 370 Queen St., Brisbane;
68 Gawler Place, Adelaide; 776 Hay St., Perth.
